

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_116382
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF CONSTRAINTS FACED BY SUGARCANE GROWERS IN HARYANA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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><u>Compulsory</u> 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. Yes, It aimed to solve community problems that are clearly visible on the ground, which is exactly what the scientific community requires from research. These types of studies have an immediate impact on improving society and the country's economy. 2. Yes, but needs improvement so that it can better describe the objective 3. Yes, but needs to be short and concise by avoiding unnecessarily details at some points and focusing only on main points 4. Yes, it is clear and appropriate 5. Yes of course 6. I suggest some additional recent references to enrich the discussion part of the manuscript and make it more appealing to the readers. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, the language the author/authors used is very clear</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>General comment: I appreciate the research issue because it is based on a community problem that is clearly visible on the ground rather than something more theoretical. These types of research have an immediate impact on improving life of society and country's economy. In addition, I have some comments and suggestions, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. TITLE: Your objective indicates that you aim to identify problems and explore potential interventions. However, your title simply stated "ANALYSIS OF CONSTRAINTS FACED BY SUGARCANE GROWERS IN HARYANA". I recommend that you improve your title so that it better describes your objective. 2.2. The abstract is too long and should not go into excessive detail about the study results, such as "Key challenges identified...". So keep it short and concise, focusing only on the problem at hand, methodology, main findings, and implications of the findings. 3. Again in your Objective, "to explore potential interventions to address these challenges effectively" is something different from simply suggesting potential intervention by analyzing the data as you exactly did in the current study. Therefore I suggest the reconstruction of the objective or go deep on your methodology on how you reached 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>upon potential intervention to address the problems.</p> <p>4. "GRAPHICALABSTRACT" the output font size is too small and not easily readable; the background is also too dark. So make it more visible to readers.</p> <p>5. The methodology part is shallower as it lacks detail clarifications. Three districts selected purposively...again One block was chosen at random from each of the three selected districts ...again two villages from each block were selected randomly...again 20 farmers from each villages; Here from how many districts of Haryana?, how many blocks in one district ? Villages? Are 20 farmers sufficiently represented? Think of representativeness and the standard methodology for sampling you used.</p> <p>6. At some paragraphs, font sizes should be corrected, for instance, page 4, some with 11 font size and some others with 12. This technical error but serious, should not be done.</p> <p>7. The conclusion part mainly repeats the result bodies. Rather, you must present your key findings and the broader implications of the findings, followed by your recommendations. As a result, I recommend reconstructing your conclusion accordingly.</p>	
--	---	--

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:	Tibebu Enkossa
Department, University & Country	Wollega University, Ethiopia