

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_102934
Title of the Manuscript:	FARM DIVERSIFICATION IN HARYANA: CASE STUDIES
Type of the Article	Case study

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The theme approached in this manuscript falls into the topic of Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology. The proposed title of the article is in accordance with the issue studied. The summary of the article is comprehensive, being composed of 251 words. The structure of the article is classic and appropriate. It can be appreciated that the manuscript is scientifically correct. The article is well built and it has a clarity of informations. There is a logic thread of the presentation and argumentation which makes the article relatively easy crossing. The used language is scientifically correct, and it can be easily read and understood not only by the specialists in the field. The style and expression of the authors are clear and coherent, no expression mistakes. The article contains 16 bibliographical sources. The most recent source is from 2022 and the oldest source is from 1996. The sources citation is made according to requirements.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is necessary to number the sections and subsections of the paper. The last sentence in Abstract section must end with a punctuation mark “.”. The term “case study” is not a keyword for a scientific article. The title of "Introduction" section is written with a font size 11 instead of 12 as in the rest of the paper. An appropriate spacing between sections and subsections of the work is required. A part of the paper text is written with indentation, and the other without; it is necessary to standardize the entire text of the paper. The papers entered in the References section are numbered. It is necessary to use the same font size 12 for all works in the References section.</p>	
<p>Optional/General 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:	Blajina Ovidiu
Department, University & Country	University Politehnica of Bucharest, Romania