

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_99355
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of growth and instability in area, production and productivity of soybean in major producing states of India
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)
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 importance of agriculture and the growth of soybean to the economy of nations cannot be overemphasized. In this respect, the study will benefit from the introduction of sections such as the theoretical framework which will examine a few theories and validate one upon this study is anchored on and literature review to examine existing previous studies on the subject with a view to identifying the gap which this study intends to fill. 2. The title needs to be reframed. For instance, the author may consider, Investigation of the dynamics of soybean cultivation in key Indian states: An analysis of growth pattern and volatility in area, yield, and output. 3. The abstract of the study is shallow. The author should expand it by including a summary of the findings and recommendations. 4. The subsections and structure are not adequate. As earlier mentioned, the author should introduce a section on the theoretical framework, literature review, summary of findings, and recommendations. 5. It is difficult to establish if the study is correct from the materials and method used. For instance, how did the author arrive at the method to use for this study? Are there other studies that have used similar methods and obtained scientific results upon which the author decided to use the same method? This should be examined by the author. 6. The study can benefit from more references when the author conducts a review of previous literature.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Language is adequate but the author should review the paper for some grammatical errors and misspellings.	
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:	Onime, Bright Enakhe
Department, University & Country	University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria