

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_99967
Title of the Manuscript:	Micro Food Processing Enterprises of Andhra Pradesh: Growth Opportunities using the PEST Analysis
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>)

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?</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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>The manuscript appears to be important for the scientific community as it provides a detailed analysis of the micro-food processing sector in Andhra Pradesh and highlights the various factors that impact the industry. This information can be valuable for researchers, policymakers, and entrepreneurs who are interested in the development of the food processing industry.</p> <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>2. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>The abstract of the article provides a comprehensive overview of the study.</p> <p>3. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate as they help to organize the information in a logical and coherent manner.</p> <p>4. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>Based on the information presented in the manuscript, it appears that the analysis is scientifically correct.</p> <p>5. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>There are several recent studies and publications that are missing. Additional recent references need more.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Reviewer's comment suggests "Major Revision" for this article. The comments for this manuscript could include the need for a more in-depth analysis and discussion of the PEST factors affecting micro-food processing enterprises in Andhra Pradesh.</p> <p>The literature review needs to be more comprehensive and up-to-date.</p> <p>The methodology section needs more detail and clarity.</p> <p>Specifically, there should be more details and examples provided to support the claims made in each of the sections, and a clearer connection between the sections should be established.</p> <p>Additionally, there is a need to expand on the limitations of the study, as well as to provide a more detailed discussion of the implications of the findings for future research and policy decisions.</p> <p>I suggest the authors reorganize the results section and present the findings more clearly and concisely.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hsiu-Jung Chou
Department, University & Country	Cheng Shiu University, Taiwan