

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_99326
Title of the Manuscript:	Utilization Pattern of TNAU banana expert system among Nendren Banana growers in Kanyakumari district.
Type of the Article	Data 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)
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)	Yes, but especially important to the banana growers in India. Yes, it is. Yes, it is comprehensive for the objective of the study. Yes, but the tables need some corrections. Yes, it is scientifically correct, but it is necessary a more detailed discussion about the results. The number of references mentioned is too limited for the purposes of this manuscript. Just emphasizing that the discussion of the results is too limited for the purposes of this manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is.	
Optional/General 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:	Frederico Denardi
Department, University & Country	Brazil