

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_104960
Title of the Manuscript:	Case Study on Production and Marketing Constraints of Sugarcane Farmers in Southern Tamil Nadu
Type of the Article	Original research

### 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary</p> <p>The abstract is fair, it represents parts of the paper. Missing the methodology, sampling and sample, and sources of many facts. Keywords are adequate</p> <p>The introduction and background are brief but appropriately clear and streamlined. Used relevant references and updated to support the subject.</p> <p>The methodology is missing</p> <p>Supporting facts to the discussion are not very clearly represented in the Figure and the Table and are not presented within the text. The table is not explained!!! And has wrong categorization of items [see suggested changes]</p> <p>The overall discussion is adequate, though not very clear, and streamlined. Furthermore, it is not validated with any relevant citations to support facts, numbers, and farmers' views and opinions!</p> <p>The conclusion is clear.</p> <p>Are there any limitations to the research???</p> <p>Review carefully the write-up for Consistency, Completeness, and to match the Journal's requirements... Add suggested references...</p> <p>Proofreading is needed</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.6**

**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>Hussin Jose Hejase</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al Maaref University, Lebanon</b>