

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_116335
Title of the Manuscript:	Structure, Conduct and Performance of firms across alternative forms of sugar in Tamil Nadu
Type of the 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript offers valuable insights for the field of study, making it a significant contribution to the scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title should specify the location of Tamil Nadu, as not all readers may be familiar with its geographical location. Also standardize the font, if the author wants to capitalize each word or lowercase.</p> <p>3. The abstract is missing key components such as the unit of analysis and the specific contributions the study makes to the field, which are essential for understanding the scope and significance of the research.</p> <p>4. Yes but I don't think double colon (:) should be used for each subtitle.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. The references cited in the manuscript are quite dated and may not reflect the most current research in the field, potentially leading to outdated information. This could suggest that the paper might not be drawing upon the most current and relevant sources to support its arguments or findings.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English used in the writing is effectively communicates the ideas and findings.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please standardize the titles for tables, either to use capital for each word or not. • No explanation about Table 2, Table 3, Table 4, Table 5, Table 6 and Table 7. The table numbers should be mentioned in-text specifically. • There is no Table 5.20 but it was mentioned in the text. • The references format styling should follow the journal format. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	The authors declare no conflict of interest

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Siti Nurhayati Khairatun
Department, University & Country	Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia