

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_97360
Title of the Manuscript:	CONSTRAINTS IN RICE FALLOW PULSES PRODUCTION IN SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
Type of the Article	Original research

### 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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary            The paper needs a major proofreading and editing [See attached Corrected Manuscript]            The abstract is adequate, it represents the paper in its parts.            Keywords are adequate            The introduction and background are very brief and need further validation with citations. I suggested certain references be added, however, the authors have to add a brief review of the already researched parts related to constraints and justify the gap for their research to be done.            The methodology representation is clear but very brief needing more elaboration. Suggestions are made to justify the style of analysis [see attached Manuscript].            Results are clearly represented in Tables and are sufficient to support the discussion.            Discussion is fair needing extensive proofreading. However, the points made based on the results are adequate, clear, and streamlined. Furthermore, it is validated with relevant citations. [See all suggestions made in citations, corrections, and organization of ideas]            The conclusion is clear.            Are there any limitations to the research???</p> <p>What Implications are to be added???</p> <p>Several references were recommended to be added to support concepts in the paper... A careful review of the write-up of the references was necessary to match the Journal's requirements... Nevertheless, more references are recommended to be added especially in the introduction to show a stronger background for the research            Proofreading is needed</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon