

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_100559
Title of the Manuscript:	Constraints and suggestions towards Supply Chain Management of Arize 6444 In Patna District of Bihar
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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Possibly</p> <p>Suggest to also add the tool name as a part of the title</p> <p>Yes, somewhat</p> <p>No, quite short</p> <p>Yes, but very low impact</p> <p>More recent references should be added</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Check and edit the language</p> <p>Check typos</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1) The manuscript is too short. Suggest that the authors explicitly add the literature review section.</p> <p>2) The references are very old. Suggest that the authors add recent papers relevant to the realm of multi-criteria decision making (MCDM). Some suggestions for the recent papers that address key aspects are for example, 1) Ransikarbum, K., Chanthakhot, W., Glimm, T., & Janmontree, J. (2023). Evaluation of Sourcing Decision for Hydrogen Supply Chain Using an Integrated Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) Tool. Resources, 12(4), 48. 2) Ransikarbum, K., & Khamhong, P. (2021). Integrated fuzzy analytic hierarchy process and technique for order of preference by similarity to ideal solution for additive manufacturing printer selection. Journal of Materials Engineering and Performance, 30(9), 6481-6492. 3) Ransikarbum, K., Pitakaso, R., Kim, N., & Ma, J. (2021). Multicriteria decision analysis framework for part orientation analysis in additive manufacturing. Journal of Computational Design and Engineering, 8(4), 1141-1157.</p> <p>3) The key contributions of the manuscript should be highlighted.</p> <p>4) Suggest that the authors add key discussion and managerial insights before the conclusion section.</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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kasin Ransikarbum
Department, University & Country	Ubon Ratchathani University, Thailand