

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_98270
Title of the Manuscript:	Do post-harvest losses affect the farmers' income? - Post-harvest loss estimation for major vegetables in South India
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Abstract: This topic needs to be rewrite.</b> The function of an abstract is to describe, not to evaluate or defend, the paper. The abstract should begin with a brief but precise statement of the problem or issue, followed by a description of the research method and design, the major findings, and the conclusions reached, <b>and MAINLY to indicate further studies.</b> Note that this version has an unusual structure.</p> <p><b>Introduction is ok.</b></p> <p><b>Theory Review: I could not find this. It's necessary to be included!</b></p> <p><b>Methodology is ok.</b></p> <p><b>Results and discussion are the best part of this paper.</b> I suggest to authors that it will improve the quality of this discussion incorporating highlight literature to enforce the considerations made.</p> <p><b>Conclusions: Its needs to be rewrite too.</b> The authors must be considerate three major parts follow structure to elaborate a new version of this topic: <b>I)</b> Answer: the thesis statement, revisited; <b>II)</b> Summary: main points and highlights from the body paragraphs and <b>III)</b> Significance: the relevance and implications of the essay's findings.</p> <p><b>References are ok.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	The whole article should be check for grammar and punctuation	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Follow author guidelines	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Claudio Zancan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidade Federal Do Paraná, Brazil</b>