Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_111190**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Growth and instability analysis of sugar exports from India**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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. Yes. The manuscript is intended to provide an understanding of the dynamics of sugar export from India. However, the use of local words to measure quantity, value etc. limits the general understanding of the manuscript. 2. Growth and instability analysis of sugar exports from India – an alternative title: Analysis of growth and instability trends of sugar exports from India. 3. Not comprehensive. As a scholarly article, the abstract requires a lot of technical writing improvement. 4. Some are appropriate. Ideally, the first paragraph of the introduction is a waste of time. No indication of the current bottlenecks, research objectives not clearly stated. The methodology fails to indicate the study design and the source of data used in the analysis. The results and discussion section are somehow detailed. The conclusion is too long instead of being concise and engaging. 5. Some improvement is required as highlighted above. 6. More references should have been added	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	It's okay.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	**Abdul Rahman Sesay**
Department, University & Country	**Njala University, Sierra Leone**