

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_96817
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Analysis of Temporal Changes In Land Use Pattern of Western Maharashtra
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>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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is pertinent to the intended Scientific Community as it spells out the analysis of land use based on temporal changes specifying the three points of time: Pre-Liberalization, Post Liberation and Over all period. Yes, title of the article is suitable. The abstract is comprehensive and concise although there are hiccups in the language and typographical errors. The structure and subsections of the manuscript is inadequate, nothing was mentioned on Pre-Liberation period, Post liberation period and overall. Period, since these are the point of reference for discussion, justification has to be made of why these periods are important and mentioned in relation to economic analysis. The manuscript is not scientifically correct because it falls short of discussion on those periods mentioned. It needs to be worked out carefully so as to include the economic analysis, otherwise it is just an interpretation of time series data. References are too insufficient for a scientific paper, and no up-to- date publications have been mentioned as the author has done an analysis till 2020. The paper has to have a strong back up of literatures.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ghosh M (2022), Liberalization, Growth and regional disparities in India, Springer. 2. Raj R.S & Singha K, (2022), The Routledge Handbook of Post -Reform Indian Economy, Routledge, India. 3. Bhalla GS & Singh G (2012), Economic Liberalization & Indian Agriculture: A District level study, Sage, India 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the language is fine, but lacks expression which may fail to capture the reader's ability to comprehend</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Conclusion & policy implications of the manuscript is too shoddy and abrupt. No authentic discussions have been made on policy implications and references are too less.</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:	P .K. Ryingna
Department, University & Country	North Eastern Hill University, India