

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology           |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJAEES_102151   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | An Analysis of Cost and Returns of Chick-pea Cultivation in Chhattisgarh |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article  |

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

|  | Reviewer's comment   | Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>1. <b>For the scientific community, the manuscript is neither robust nor technically sound. It presents methodological deficiencies and lack of ethical aspects.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes, the title is appropriate for the purpose and conclusion</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes, the summary is comprehensive and adequate</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes, they are.</b></p> <p>5. <b>No. The methodology is incomplete. The population was identified only in the abstract. In statistics, data quality control analysis was not performed: validity and reliability. At no time were the Ethical Aspects mentioned. The procedures used for data collection were not widely described.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Only six references were cited in the entire manuscript.</b></p> <p>7. <b>7. The manuscript is well illustrated with several tables, but it is not engaging. It presented important deficiencies in Materials and Methods, such as lack of identification of the studied population and analysis of validity and reliability of the presented data. The statistic was poor. He used only media for his comparisons.</b></p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | Yes.   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | Although the abstract was good, methodological and ethical deficiencies compromised the quality of the manuscript.   |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Márcia Andrade Queiroz Ozanam</b>   |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Sao Paulo, Brasil</b> |