

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_103126
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on consumer buying behavior of vermicompost in Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. I would consider this study as being an empirical study to investigate farmer's buying behavior towards vermicompost which will promote sustainable agriculture for small farmers. It is relevant to modern marketing of agribusiness in terms of farming outputs Yes Yes. Only that it failed to cover the data analysis and the implications of the study. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate except that there is no section for the Literature Review which is not acceptable at this level. The paper needs to be more scientifically correct and technically sound as there is no depth and breadth of the research design, data collection methods, data analysis techniques, and the integration of previous research into the discussion. The motivation to conduct the study in view of the current state of the art is well-defined. The method section must have the following subsections: research design, population of the study, sampling procedures and sample size, data collect instrument and procedures, data analysis and research ethics. You must read more on the topic to improve the references for a better paper 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author(s) must do well to improve the quality of English in the paper. This can be done through the use of "Grammarly" or the help of a Proof Reader. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the in-text citation were not appropriate and could not be found in the reference list. e.g Sharma et. al., (2018), Sinha et. al., (2021) No discussion with the result due to inadequate literature review The organisation of the paper is ok but the content needs improvement at this level. The author must avoid the Researcher found that , please the Researcher must replace it with the study found that or concluded that. The literature review must consider the theories on consumer buying behaviour and factors affecting consumer buying decisions. The result section is good but due to weak literature review that section lack good discussions with the literature The author must avoid statements like "the table below or the Figure above", instead must name it as Table 1 or Figure 1 in the text. The major findings must be part of the results The suggestions or recommendations must not be in a bullet point rather in an expanded version. <p>Taking a quality time to do a paper is very important for the author's, readership and the journal.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> No	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Charles Adusei
Department, University & Country	Garden City University College, Ghana