

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_105565
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDY ON PREDICTING THE PRICE OF COCONUT IN TAMIL NADU MARKET
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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, avi works that investigate growth based on the use of natural resources are always current, this work is like that. Coke is very important in the chemical industry, its deposits can significantly affect the growth of the economy. This is the case in this paper.</p> <p>Yes, very current.</p> <p>No, the conclusions should have been more specifically included in this work summary, otherwise the conclusion of this work is very minor, small, below the standard of how to write a paper conclusion.</p> <p>Most parts of the paper are ok, the results are very well presented, however, the Summary, Conclusion and Literature are not very adequate, they need to be worked on and improved.</p> <p>This structure of the work is in accordance with international standards for writing this type of work, except for the shortcomings that I mentioned earlier.</p> <p>The references are not sufficiently well researched, the latest works from the field from which the author is writing his paper have not been consulted. Therefore, the references had to be more numerous, more recent, for journal references to prevail. Therefore, we suggest the author to cite similar works as we state: DOI: https://doi.org/10.2478/eoik-2023-0013 DOI: https://doi.org/10.2478/eoik-2023-0015 DOI: https://doi.org/10.2478/eoik-2023-0006 It is mandatory to cite these papers, they are recent papers from 2023</p> <p>I advocate that the author respects all the recommendations of the reviewers, especially regarding the citation of the proposed works.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	No	

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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zoran Mastilo
Department, University & Country	University of East Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina