

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_90354
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE ECONOMICS OF TRADITIONAL AND MODERN DAIRY FARMS IN EASTERN U.P.
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:

(<https://www.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Introduction</b> about the situation of the study area should be added which include the research problem and statement.</li> <li>Objective of the study in <b>research methodology</b> is to be aligned with the topic of the research paper.</li> <li>Research findings discussion should be included with similar findings in related field.</li> <li>The Data displayed in table 3 and 4 about <b>Cost and returns on different size group of Modern and Traditional Milk Producers</b> should be depicted in Rupees/ Price and not based on the number of respondents. In Table 4, <b>Cost Benefit ratio should be calculated to know the comparative return from the two enterprises. The Gross cost and other variables are questionable as they show very low prices on each one of them.</b></li> <li><b>Conclusion</b> should be purely based on your own research findings and according to the objective of your research study.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Font Theme and Font size should be unique</li> <li>SL No is missing in the table</li> <li>Bold the names of the author highlighted from the review of literatures</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall the research paper is good.	

### 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:	Dasiewdorshisha Sancley
Department, University & Country	Raffles University, India