

## Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_125745
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>BUYING BEHAVIOUR ANALYSIS OF FLUID MILK CONSUMERS IN MEHSANA DISTRICT OF GUJARAT</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I like this manuscript as it is focusing on behaviour of the consumers who are using the fluid milk. Milk is essential to different age categories as it is very much needed for the healthy living. The study has been conducted in both rural and urban areas so that we can have the clear idea about the consumption pattern and buyer behaviour in both the zones. Moreover, the analysis has been done effectively.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I Suggest the title as  AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS ON BUYER BEHAVIOUR OF FLUID MILK USERS IN MEHSANA DISTRICT,GUJARAT	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive  keywords can be changed with the following words. <i>Buying Behaviour, Consumption Expenditure, Fluid Milk, Survey Schedule, Home produced Milk</i>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	1.The objectives should be included before methodology 2. Major Findings and Recommendations should be included before conclusion	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The analysis part is good But in Table 5 and Table 6 Regression Analysis the N should be 80. But the no. is different. It should be changed. All other part of the analysis is relevant and it is conveying the appropriate results to take decisions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	References are sufficient	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Ok.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Article is drafted nicely but focus is more on analysis part. If possible, the author can add the need for the study, statement of the problem also.	

### 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>	

## Review Form 3

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>M. Kavitha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Guru Nanak College, India</b>