

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_123644
Title of the Manuscript:	Structural changes in Haryana Agriculture
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript addresses a crucial aspect of structural transformation in agriculture, particularly in the Haryana region, which is vital for both national and state-level economic planning. The study's long-term perspective from 1970 to 2021 provides valuable insights into agricultural and economic shifts, essential for policy formulation and agricultural innovation. However, further clarity and depth in analyzing the impact of industrialization on agricultural productivity could enhance its relevance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title " Structural Changes in Haryana Agriculture " is generally suitable, as it accurately reflects the study's content. However, a more detailed title like " Economic Diversification and Agricultural Transformation in Haryana (1970-2021) " could better capture the comprehensive analysis presented.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from briefly addressing the broader implications of the findings, particularly how the structural changes in agriculture align with national economic policies and global trends. Additionally, mention of the study's key methodologies (such as CAGR analysis) would enhance the reader's understanding.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are appropriately structured and follow a logical progression. However, the paper could benefit from a distinct section summarizing policy recommendations based on the findings, particularly regarding agricultural innovation and industrial policies.	
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 manuscript is scientifically robust, as it employs a rigorous methodology, including sectoral analysis and CAGR calculations. The use of historical data from reliable sources enhances the paper's credibility. The conclusions drawn about the shift from agriculture to industry and services are sound, supported by strong data and statistical analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally sufficient and include a mix of recent and older works. However, more up-to-date sources on agricultural innovations, especially post-2020, would strengthen the paper's relevance to current academic discussions.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is mostly clear, but some sentences are overly complex and could be simplified for better comprehension. Improving the clarity and flow of certain sections, especially the Methodology and Results, would enhance readability for a broader audience.	
Optional/General comments	The figures and tables included are relevant, but the captions could be more descriptive, explaining the trends shown more explicitly. For example, Figure 6 (Per Capita Income) would benefit from a more detailed explanation of the factors driving the observed trends.	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sandip Sarker
Department, University & Country	Bangladesh