

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_121385
Title of the Manuscript:	Economics of production of Bajra in Solapur district
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	The manuscript provides new empirical data specific to Bajra cultivation in the Solapur district, utilising detailed cost structures and returns. However, the study follows a traditional economic analysis framework without significant methodological innovation. Also, the manuscript would benefit from a more detailed discussion on the limitations and potential biases in data collection and analysis.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	No. The author(s) did not specify the articles contribution to knowledge nor discuss what the manuscript hopes to achieve in abstract. The methodologies are not well explained	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	They are partly appropriate.	
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 discussion section is grossly inadequate. There is a need to discuss on the implication of study and extend the study's implications by connecting the findings to broader agricultural policies or practices. Also, the author needs to highlight how the study could influence other regions with similar agricultural conditions or contribute to broader economic theories in agriculture.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	No. No single in-text citation was used throughout the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adewale Ogunmodede
Department, University & Country	Royal Agricultural University, United Kingdom