

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_107941
Title of the Manuscript:	The trends and growth analysis in the area, production and productivity of turmeric in Surguja district of Chhattisgarh
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>"The secondary data on area, production and productivity of Turmeric in Chhattisgarh, were collected for the period 2001-02 to 2015-16 from various publications"</p> <p>The sentence above reveals that the information in this article already appears in several publications and does not provide any new information.</p> <p>2- The title is not appropriate. I suggest "growth analysis in the area, production and productivity of turmeric in Surguja district of Chhattisgarh. The review"</p> <p>3- Yes.</p> <p>4- Yes.</p> <p>5- I do not believe that the article is scientifically adequate. Relevant bibliographic citations are missing in the body of the article. The article states that it performed statistical analysis,</p> <p>5.1 - Includes analyzes of other articles.</p> <p>5.2 The data in table 2 on "area" and "production" are not significant and are not scientifically analyzable but were analyzed.</p> <p>5.3 Table 2 contains "positive and significant" data on productivity, but they are "negative and significant" and are not compatible with figure 2.</p> <p>6- References are not enough. There are several unsubstantiated statements, for example: "It is one of India's oldest and longest-lasting exports."</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Apparently yes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Fernando Ramos dos Reis
Department, University & Country	Federal Institute of Science and Technology of Goiás, Aveiro University, Brazil