

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_100291
Title of the Manuscript:	An analysis of constraints faced by the farmers and intermediaries in cultivation and value addition of pineapple in Manipur State
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>)

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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The research is one of the good researches in this field, and the appropriate research and analytical method was used, and the results were consistent with economic theory and statistically correct, so the research is good and does not contain scientific, statistical or spelling errors, but I advise the researcher to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The research is good and valid for publication after modifying the following (very important): - Clarifying how the random sample was selected, as the researcher did not explain how the random sample was selected? - Explain how to select a random sample and place it in the research method. - Developing clearer recommendations through the results drawn, accompanied by figures. - The research is good and valid for publication after making the required modifications. - Expansion of writing recommendations attached to the research results 	

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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sarhan Ahmed Soliman
Department, University & Country	Agriculture Economy Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center, Egypt