

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_76931
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Analysis of Pearl millet cultivation in Rainfed ecosystem of Thoothukudi district
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Unfortunately, the document cannot be published in this way. Although the methodology used has been explained, I need to know more information, a real methodological note should be generated. Furthermore, paragraph 3 should be adapted and implemented with paragraph 3.1. Well the tables, but I would need to read the questionnaire used and understand if these results can be generalized or not. Furthermore, the conclusions thus posed seem to me coarse and not very "scientific", it would be necessary to improve their style and form, adding a paragraph of "Discussions", where it is highlighted why it is a topic of interest in India, because it was chosen to present it in this way in the newspaper, why those peasants were selected and how one might think of bringing this analysis to interested parties. In this way there will be the possibility to insert, within the conclusions, all that is necessary to give scientificity to the topic and make it become of interest.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Vincenzo Auriemma
Department, University & Country	University of Salerno, Italy