

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_114193
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDY THE INPUT USE PATTERN AND COST AND RETURNS OF HYBRID COTTON SEED PRODUCTION IN KARNATAKA, 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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes. The article entitled “Study the Input Use Pattern and Cost and Returns of Hybrid Cotton Seed Production in Karnataka, India” is significant for the scientific community. The researcher mainly focuses on input, cost and returns of hybrid seed production. The main objectives of this article are to study the cost and returns in hybrid cotton seed production and to study the labour use pattern in hybrid cotton seed production in the study area. The researcher concluded that there is a scarcity of labour, particularly skilled labour.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of article is comprehensive</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references given by the researcher are sufficient.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Source for Table No.1, Table No.2, Table No.3, Table No.4, Table No.5 and Table No.6 has not written by the researcher.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Nagamani K N
Department, University & Country	GFGC, India