

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_105011
Title of the Manuscript:	Marketing efficiency of cocoon in Salem district of Tamil Nadu
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the issue of silkworm breeding, production and processing of silk cocoons is very important in the agricultural and textile industries, and its different aspects should be investigated in different areas.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>3. The abstract is compiled correctly and in principle.</p> <p>4. The structure is scientific and correct, but it has deficiencies that were mentioned in the text.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct to some extent, but the mentioned defects should be corrected.</p> <p>6. The references used are not enough because the researcher did not analyze the results of his work and cited few references.</p> <p>In general, the structure of the article is acceptable, but some flaws were pointed out in it that should be resolved by the author so that the article can be accepted and presented and accepted scientifically.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the English language of the article is suitable for scientific communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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:	<b>Mohammad Reza Zargaran Khouzani</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Khuzestan University of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, Iran</b>