

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
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	

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. No. No.  (1) At some point, the author needs to cite Maslow for the needs hierarchy and establish that food, shelter etc... is the basic needs. (2) The premise is wrong. The author's premise is that to feed more, there needs to be more processed foods. I would dare the author to find a cite for that one. Processing food actually makes less food. (3) There is a purpose statement in the abstract but not one in the main body of the4 paper. (4) PEST definitely needs some kind of reference unless the author pulled that one out of the air. Even if it was pulled out of the air, there has to be something similar somewhere to cite (again, is the author ripping-off Maslow?) (5) There should be a Limitations sub-section of the conclusions w/ future avenues for research.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Needs a copy-edit brush.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Need to buff the scholarship up.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ralph J Johnson
Department, University & Country	UT-MDACC, USA