

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_112355
Title of the Manuscript:	An Analysis of TOP (Tomato, Onion and Potato) Price Dynamics in India
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>It seems interesting for policy decision makers in India so I think it has some merits.</p> <p>Since research itself is “an analysis” I recommend not to use these words in the title. Rather directly write TOP price dynamics in India. The abstract does not provide much idea about the research objectives, methodology used, major findings, contributions of the study in the field, conclusions and implications. There is no mention about objectives and problem statement is not properly raised. It is essential to do that in a research paper. Only findings are presented in the entire paper without any kind of “analysis.” Also, a research paper needs literature review which highlights what others are studying in the given field (it is missing here!) the conclusions should be based on the “analysis of data presented however as stated earlier there is none. Need to add comprehensive “analysis” section to make it really “scientific” work.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Without doing a comprehensive “analysis of data” with proper literature review, appropriate conclusions and relating those with what other researchers are doing in the field of study the writing does not meet the criteria of a scholarly communication. Hence, my comments remain the same as suggested above.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Conclusions of article should be based on the analysis, discussion should be related with other studies, contributions made by the current research in the field of study has to be highlighted, some limitations of the study should also be mentioned and recommendations for the future research is required in a research paper. So, I suggest to add all these to make it a real academic work.</p>	

[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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sushil Kumar Pant
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal