

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJAEES_118038
Title of the Manuscript:	The scenario of groundwater pollution after implementation of zero liquid discharge – An agricultural economic perspective
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript provides an in-depth insight on the effects of water conditions near the Noyyal river on local agriculture based on an economical perspective. I am thoroughly impressed with the thoughtful analysis and experimental set up, as well as the data collected and presentation of the story. The manuscript is perfect for the scientific community. The title of the manuscript is perfectly suitable. The abstract of this article is comprehensive and provides a concise summary of the whole manuscript. The subsections and structuring of this manuscript can be improved by adding subtitle headings to help split the results and discussion section up. More adjustments and transitional sentences can be added to help guide the readers better. The results discussed in this manuscript seems to have a valid explanation and contains no scientific inaccuracy. The manuscript contains a wide range of references dating back to 1993 and are as recent as 2021, enough to cover commonly known information and recent advancements. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The language used is suitable for scholarly communications, but some transitional phrasing can be added to help improve manuscript's readability. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I enjoyed reading through this manuscript a lot and found the data collection of this article to be very in depth. The manuscript is clearly phrased and well-structured. However, some additional clarification is needed for revisions, but otherwise, this manuscript is fantastic.</p> <p>The manuscript can be improved with some minor revisions to the editing of this article.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Sunyapat Akkarajeerawat
Department, University & Country	Bangkok Christian College, Thailand