

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_115248
Title of the Manuscript:	Preference Analysis of Pigeonpea Varietal Attributes Among Farmers and Traders in Kalyana - Karnataka Region: A Conjoint Analysis Approach
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The part of the "Abstract" should not only bring forward results and findings but also stress their significance for future researches. Please add more content in the abstract section. It should not exceed 300 words in length. 2. In the introduction section, the second paragraph is not cited. For example, "<i>The preferences of farmers for pigeonpea varieties in the Kalyana Karnataka region are deeply influenced by key attributes such as crop duration, resistance to pests and diseases, output price, and yield levels</i>". From where did you get this information? The source of this information should be mentioned in the manuscript. Please give a citation for each definition, idea, and statement that you have obtained from other sources. 3. In the methodology section, nothing is cited. The formula of additive conjoint model is not cited. Please check this part. 4. Tables should be cited inside the text like, Table 1, Table 2..... Tables & figures should be placed inside the text. 5. Table 1 and 2 are not cited anywhere in the manuscript. They should be placed inside the text. 6. In your manuscript, information presented in the Fig. 1 is repeated in the Table 3. Information presented in the figure should not be repeated in the table. 7. Abbreviations like RSK, KVK, AEEC, TS-3R and GRG-811, their illustrations are not clearly written in your manuscript. You must create suitable environment for the readers of your article. Please, all symbols and abbreviations used in the illustrations should be defined clearly. 8. In the text, it should be used "%" rather than "percent". Therefore, please revise this throughout the manuscript. 9. In the conclusion and reference sections, you are following an uncommon format. Please remove a series of numbers from the left side of your manuscript. 10. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3]. When there are two or more references cited in the same sentence or paragraph, please enclose all the reference numbers in one bracket, such as [2, 3], [6-8] and [4, 9-12]. Please check and revise all of them. 11. All references should follow the following style: "Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98". Authors name, Title, Year, Volume, Issue, and Page. Please check and revise. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is suggested that the author go through the paper and do a quick check on probable grammatical errors and existing spelling mistakes.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Sisay Yohannes Gagabo
Department, University & Country	Bonga University, Ethiopia