

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_99994
Title of the Manuscript:	Identifying Constraints in Decision Making in Sago Industries in 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>)

[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? 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>To some extent: The manuscript is not completely innovative except spatial contribution</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The flow is acceptable. However the literature review and the theoretical framework are not sufficiently addressed. Further diagnosis of the analytical model is not shown to ensure the appropriateness of the model.</p> <p>Majority of the references are 15+ years older. I think a lot of recent publications are available and better to include recent literature.</p> <p>possible improvement could be to provide more context and background information on the introduction and literature review. Additionally, the manuscript could benefit from a clearer and more concise description and diagnosis of the methodology and findings of the ISM analysis.</p>	

Minor REVISION comments	yes	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abebe Alemu
Department, University & Country	National University of Science and Technology, Oman