

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_102118
Title of the Manuscript:	AWARENESS AND BRAND PREFERENCE OF CHICKPEA GROWERS TOWARDS SELECTED PESTICIDES IN JUNAGADH DISTRICT OF GUJARAT
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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1.The manuscript has practical significance for scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article should be shorter to avoid word repetition with the introduction. You should indicate the sample size, how the sample was selected and the method used to get the results of the research done. (This is also the goal of the study.)</p> <p>4.The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. In conclusion, the Authors/authors should briefly state the research results</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references should be cited in the study.</p> <p>7. Suggestion and Policy implication should be more specific</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This paper is required compulsory revision comments.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nguyen Thi Dung
Department, University & Country	Bac Giang Agriculture and Forestry University, Vietnam