

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_101133
Title of the Manuscript:	Status of Coconut Farmer Producer Companies (CPCs) in Western Tamil Nadu
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>)

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>Yes, it is important for scientific community</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable</p> <p>The abstract is not comprehensive. It lacks methodologies adopted i.e Research design, sampling technique and data analysis techniques.</p> <p>Yes, they are.</p> <p>Yes, it is.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The references are not sufficient. The introduction part lacks reference because where is the researcher get all those information, from and yet not one citation. The first reference, Coconut Development Board, it is not correct. The researcher should employ Mendeley so that it comes out clean. The researcher should add more references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The researcher should revisit how to online citation. The last reference is not correct.</p> <p>Avoid very short paragraphs.</p> <p>Specific Objective and not objectives because it is just one.</p> <p>It should be Table 1: Table 2: Table 3: and not Table: 1</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hussein Mohamed Abdullai
Department, University & Country	Egerton University, Kenya