

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_118293
Title of the Manuscript:	An Economic Analysis of Vellore GI Spiny Brinjal in Organic and Inorganic Vegetable Farming
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The manuscript is important for the scientific community ➤ The title is suitable ➤ The abstract is comprehensive ➤ The structure is appropriate ➤ The manuscript is scientifically correct ➤ But references are not sufficient, and the references located at 4 and 9 are not recent. <p>.....</p> <p>Additional comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Try to correct the text issues coloured with yellow (change future tense to simple past tense or past perfect tense. ✓ Better to omit numbers in the reference (1, 2, 3.....9) ✓ Try to revise the conclusion part (<p>Can we say that BCR difference value of 0.24 is viable?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Minor revisions need to make 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the article is good for the scientific society</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:	Ayele Tesfahun Gashu
Department, University & Country	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Ethiopia