

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_97046
Title of the Manuscript:	Consumers' Opinions and Constraints towards Buying Jute Products in Jalpaiguri and Ludhiana district- A Comparative Study
Type of the Article	Short 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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	1. The presented research attempted the application of some statistical methods to analyse a sampled dataset. While the work contains important inferences, some data inconsistencies and organizational and language issues still need to be addressed to improve the article. 2. Yes. 3. The abstract may be significantly improved by restructuring it, adding high-impact statements, and giving stronger justification/motivation for conducting the research. See more comments on the manuscript. 4. The article's structure can be improved, as suggested by comments in the manuscript. Some sub-heading and numbering are required. Also, some paragraphs should be re-arranged to achieve better structure and flow. 5. There are numerous data inconsistencies in the manuscript--due diligence is needed to ensure they did not result in incorrect conclusions. The mode of statistical analyses should be stated clearly in the manuscript; were they done manually or using specific software? 6. Some quoted data need supporting references (Please see comments in the manuscript). Thus, additional references may be included to further support some of the claims in the manuscript. 7. You may want to provide more description of the study's geographical location—maybe a map of geographical coordinates—longitude/latitude, etc.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is a need for a significant English language review of the manuscript to improve readability and convey the intended meanings.	
Optional/General comments	Please pay close attention to reviewing the inconsistencies in the numerical values in the tables, as highlighted in the comments on the manuscript.	

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:	Adeyemi Adegoke Adeleke
Department, University & Country	Texas A&M University, USA