

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_108626
Title of the Manuscript:	Resource use and Economic potential of Chick Pea Cultivation in Haryana
Type of the Article	Resource use and Economic potential of Chickpea Cultivation in Haryana

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The theme of the manuscript submitted emphasize the allocation and efficient use of resources to harness the economic potential of chickpea over a geographical area, which do catch the attention of the peers and carry a great significance in the current context</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>English writing skills can be improved in the manuscript. It feels like the manuscript was written in very general format. It can be improved much.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. Abstract is plagued with incomplete sentences and grammatical errors, and lack proper scientific flavour</p> <p>2. Conclusion can be re-phrased as the wording used in the manuscript can be much more improved</p> <p>3. The names of districts, chickpea can be written in a proper and uniform way</p> <p>4. The co-efficient of determination (<math>R^2</math>) values were nowhere mentioned in the Table. 3. As suggested in the results</p> <p>5. The discussion for the analysed results was not written properly, which can be included in few sentences at the end of the results to support the findings</p> <p>6. The article in current condition needs more efforts to bring into a lively way of representation of the results.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nandipamu Tony Manoj Kumar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>G. B. Pant University of Agriculture &amp; Technology, India</b>