

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_99491
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Productivity and Profitability in Wheat through Rotavator
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)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The paper considers the issue of assessing the economic feasibility of using Resource conservation technologies in wheat cultivation. The results of the study are based on the processing of statistical data obtained through selective observation and are justified. The paper may be of interest to specialists who conduct analytical research in the field of agriculture. The title of the paper is suitable. Paper's abstract is informative enough and corresponds to the paper's content The structure of the paper is appropriate, and the subsections are justified. Paper is scientifically correct. References are sufficient and recent, but the statement "Cost concept developed by the Commission for Agricultural Costs and Prices (CACP) was used...", section "Analytical Tools," requires a link to the data source. <p>Additional comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is worth specifying the period covered by the study. Table 1 contains the SD indicator. It needs an explanation for its purpose since its meaning is not used in the text of the paper. 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Svitlana Grygoruk
Department, University & Country	Khmelnyskyi National University, Ukraine