

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_101918
Title of the Manuscript:	Concentration and Diversification of Crops in Ambedkar Nagar District of Uttar Pradesh
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://journalajgr.com/index.php/AJGR/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>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. It is interesting in the sense of knowing the distribution of crops in a region and its representation at a certain scale. But it represents a descriptive analysis of production based on the concentration and diversification of crops.</p> <p>2. YES.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes, yes, however, I suggest in results to change the subsections by year and describe the results: for example</p> <p>4.1. year 2000 results of concentration and diversification in the year 2000.</p> <p>4.2. year 2018 the same from 2000 to the year 2018.</p> <p>4.3. (the comparative analysis of both years adding the important points that you want to report according to the comparison of both years)</p> <p>In my opinion, you should focus on the temporary part than on the crops.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Requires a review of the reference format, there are some that are incomplete or are just a link</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	See manuscript.	

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:	Miguel Armando López Beltrán
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of Sinaloa, México