

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_89880
Title of the Manuscript:	SOCIO ECONOMIC STUDY OF COTTON GROWERS AND CONSTRAINTS IN COTTON PRODUCTION IN BHADRADRI KOTHAGUDEM DISTRICT OF TELANGANA
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Author has to rewrite the beginning part of abstract which need to focus given content if the study. 2. Author should encompass the language editing work for the entire work 3. Check the selection of blocks, there is only 22 blocks out of 23 which the study actually reports. 4. Author need to mention the total number of villages from selected taluk and purpose of choosing five villages. And also lost out the selected villages. 5. How did you choose 100 cotton growers from five villages?, How many from each village?, what type of sampling technique you have adopted?. 6. Author has to rewrite the part of research methodology which shows unclear methods. 7. Author has mentioned that the respondents are classified into three different size of farm groups. But, the study exposed four types below the content in selection of sample respondents/farmers. Justify it. 8. Author has listed number of sub titles. So, it need to be minimised by a single main title. 9. Part of data and graphical presentation is missed to expose the data for large farmers. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The part of introduction seems like incomplete. Author has to check and complete it. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The part of tabulation and evaluation is somewhat designed. 	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	T. Amose
Department, University & Country	Madurai Kamaraj University, India