

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_116577
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio-Economic Profile of Fruit Crop Growers of Karnataka and their Relationship with Entrepreneurial Behaviour
Type of the Article	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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes the manuscript is very important for the scientific community</p> <p>Yes, the title of the manuscript is suitable</p> <p>The abstract of the manuscript is good, but lacks method of data analysis.</p> <p>Yes the structure of subsections of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent, but lacks uniform reference style under reference section.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>the quality of language is good and suitable</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The introduction is good and soundable, but lacks showing the gap which has been previously studies by different scholars and intended to fill this study. In Methodology it is good, but lacks the way how can you analysis the data.</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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Melsew Nibret Mazengiya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mekdela Amba University, Ethiopia</b>