

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_127123
Title of the Manuscript:	Constraints of agripreneurs engaged in value addition of jackfruit in Kerala
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article has issued a relevant topic related to agribusiness as South Asian countries are moving towards scientific agriculture and emerging feeders of agriculture products to the world. The topic is relevant in the sense that it addresses financial aspects of one the sought for fruits namely Jack Fruit. Selection of topic of local type is the factor that made me like it.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable as it has tried to explore the financial aspects of the agribusiness related to jack fruit. Finance is the life blood of any business undertakings.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. The abstract is silent on population and sample size and sampling technique. Similarly, results sections should be in numerical in nature such as percentage, score, proportion etc.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Sample size is small which may not represent true population. Reliability of the questionnaire is missing. Literature review is completely missing.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not sufficient add more references with proper citation.	
Minor REVISION comments	Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Add literature review. Write on reliability of the questionnaire. Revise abstract. Justify your sample size and sampling technique.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dharma Raj Upreti
Department, University & Country	Oxford College of Engineering & Management, Nepal