

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_102003
Title of the Manuscript:	AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF PRODUCTION OF MAGUR HATCHERIES IN BANKURA DISTRICT OF WEST BENGAL
Type of the Article	Quantitative Research Article and case study

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	 1. The authors are told to make more evident the importance of this study. There are some lines that developed slightly the importance of the economy in this field. Be more accurate in this regard. 2. It sure is. 3. It sure is. The abstract is clear. 4. Partially, the subsections are okay. However, those are developed slightly and need to provide detailed information that give stronger insights. 5. It is. However, the methodology isn't clear. The authors need to improve this section a lot. It means, the manuscript is written scientifically but as the paper lacks of methodology procedure, this allow the manuscript seems lack of reliability. Please, see additional feedback in the paper.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 1. It is.	
Optional/General comments	The paper must be more accurate in some sections such as the Research Methodology, Results and Discussions and summary / conclusions.	

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	William Ricardo Ortiz Garcia
Department, University & Country	Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas, Colombia