

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_102687
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of market participation and price spread of Chickpea in Bemetara district of Chhattisgarh
Type of the 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> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (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>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. Analysis of market margin is quite important for decision making and academics particularly for research endeavours in agribusiness and Agrieconomics fields of study.</p> <p>Yes, it is suitable but there are some pitfalls. According to the result part of the paper, it seems like "Market channels analysis of the Chickpea in Bemetara district of Chhattisgarh". So better to be articulated in this manner because determination of market participation was not addressed in the result section.</p> <p>Abstract is not comprehensive. It does not indicate the highlights of methodology; it does not indicate the way forward and the key words even incorrect. Market participation shall never be a key word because it was not addressed.</p> <p>Not well structured. Objectives were not clearly put. Market participation section is missing, methodology does not comprise all subsections, and recommendation is missing, complete lack of references in body part and wrong literatures in reference sections.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically incorrect for me. No methodology. No reference, No Recommendation, No concrete Conclusion. Not supported with empirical evidences.</p> <p>No reference at all. Only 2 citations in result and discussion sections. It is not scientific research.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	It is good to certain extent	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The paper lacks a lot of things. The way this manuscript developed unfits scientific approaches and procedures as I have tried to touch measure concerns here above. Apart from measure issues the following minor issues should get attention from the author/s. tables and figure do not indicate the sources where the data was obtained. The result part has problem of summarization that all tables can be merged into one table. Figure 1 legend for total product and marketable surplus is ambiguous do not colour similarity. Conclusion is simple summary of marketing channels. And so many problems were detected and must be corrected to the standard.</p>	

### PART 2:

	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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Takele Honja Abate
Department, University & Country	Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia