

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAAR_121280</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Farmers' preferences for different brands and the challenges they have in finding high-quality tomato seeds: A review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Perspective article on Consumer Behaviour in Agricultural Marketing</b>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a mismatch between the title and content of the manuscript as all the manuscript is about MSME Sector. (How is it related)</li> <li>Lack of clarity regarding topic is observed in all the manuscript.</li> <li>Data Analysis part is missing.</li> <li>Mentioned references is not part of manuscript</li> </ul>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The title is Good and well justified in itself</li> </ul>	
<b>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.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, it is well justified.</li> </ul>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	No, All the content of the manuscript is not matching with abstract and conclusion. Abstract and Conclusion is okay but content of the manuscript is different. (It is only about MSME and it's different than famer's buying behaviour.	
<b>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.</b>	Need to restructure it. There's nothing related to name of the title and data analysis. Reference style is also mismatch.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	References are not in proper format and some references are not mentioned in Manuscript.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	English/Language quality is normal.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Review Form 3

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Savan Padaliya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Indian Institute of Sustainability, Gujarat University, India</b>