

## Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_128337
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield and Economic Analysis of Moth bean under rainfed condition of Villupuram District, Tamil Nadu, India
Type of the 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The topic is of relevance to the farmers and the decision makers in the agricultural field. It has many implications for the betterment of the crop producers.	
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, it is fine.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	They are sufficient and up to date.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The main issue is the language structure. I have highlighted most of them in the margin of the manuscript as my comments.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article may be accepted for publication after version.	

### 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Belle Louis Jinot
Department, University & Country	Open University of Mauritius, Mauritius

# Review Form 3