

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_105519
Title of the Manuscript:	CONSTARINTS FACED BY FARMERS IN SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT OF ONION IN KURNOOL DISTRICT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Off course the manuscript is important to the scientific community in the way that it tried to address supply chain management of onion and identifying constraints faced by farmers(original suppliers) of Onion in the selected target areas. Additionally, the manuscript come up with better research ideas which is different from usual researches.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Its not suitable because of the first words. I suggest if it will be stated as" Factors Affecting Supply Chain Management Of Onion in case of Farmers Kurnool District of Andhra Pradesh "	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Abstract of the manuscript is not comprehensive. It didn't captured enough information for the readers and unable to contains the criteria expected from the abstract to fulfil such as; 1. Why this research was designed 2. Objectives 3. Who are target population, sampling technique, sample size 4. Methodology utilized to conduct the study 5. It has to be italic	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	As a manuscript it was expected to fulfil 2 precondition; 1. Content validity and 2. Criteria validity But this manuscript didn't fulfil both validity. The way the subsection was putted and structure of the manuscript was not appropriate enough to address enough information for the readers.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	The manuscript was not scientifically correct since it didn't fulfil the above both mentioned precondition (content validity and criteria validity)	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	I have no problems with references.	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Overall comments for this manuscript; 1. To address the intended objectives the manuscript has to be scientifically and appropriately organized. 2. Really its not powerful and sounded manuscript which deserves to be published but after the major correction will be made it will be better to accept it. 3. Better to fulfil both content validity and criteria validity	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It will be okay after all the necessary modification will be made but for now its not enough	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. It has to be organized enough scientifically.2. Under all topics needs to address the intended target for instance under abstract,methodology,result and discussion and conclusion	

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:	Mikiyas Birahanu Teshome
Department, University & Country	Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia