

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_127689
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic assessment of Mahaneem (<i>Melia dubia</i>)- Mung bean (<i>Vigna radiata</i>) based agroforestry system in semi-arid regions of Bundelkhand
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This paper conducts an economic analysis of agroforestry systems, evaluating the costs and returns of these systems. By assessing cultivation costs and net profits, it can help farmers and policymakers make more informed decisions about resource management. The study offers potential solutions for improving economic returns in semi-arid regions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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 lacks a clear conclusion. It is recommended to briefly include the main findings and implications of the study in the abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The introduction lacks a clear statement of the research objectives and hypotheses. In the methodology section, there is no mention of the use of statistical software to perform a more precise comparison between the results. It is recommended to revise both sections to include these important elements for clarity and scientific rigor.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article could benefit from some improvements, particularly in terms of sentence structure and scientific terminology. A revision for clarity, accuracy, and consistency would enhance its suitability for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	In the Results and Discussion section, the article does not thoroughly analyze the findings or clearly relate them to the research objectives. This section seems to only mention some results without providing a deeper analysis or interpretation. To improve, the authors should provide a more detailed interpretation of the results, compare them with previous studies, and offer practical suggestions. Additionally, the connection between the findings and the initial hypotheses should be more explicitly discussed .	

Review Form 3

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:	Shahrazad Khatibi
Department, University & Country	Iran