

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_111194
Title of the Manuscript:	Analyzing the seasonal variations and price trends in major onion markets of India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)	Yes, but given the onion's price trajectory, the title was overdone in India. The author ought to include a model that accounts for the variations in onion prices in India.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Rather, the study's abstract ought to be composed concisely in a single paragraph, include an introduction, and conclude with a recommendation. A reader should be drawn in by the abstract writing system's coherence.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not totally, the document lags different sources (the author hasn't well references and gives recognition for the earlier authors), the methods part and analysis part were too weak.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	No, but you can fix it. Make an effort to read previous papers that have been written on this topic. Although the title was appealing, it needs to be combined with new ideas, theories, and models.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Inadequate and the writer ought to supplement and acknowledge earlier research.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript has serious issues with flow of ideas, punctuation, grammar, and space. Each table's debate was not thoroughly covered.	
Optional/General comments		
	Re-work the manuscript by adding additional models.	

[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:	Alemayehu Temesgen Befikadu
Department, University & Country	Andhra University, India