

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_115237
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Socio-economic profile, household income and risk aversion behaviours of dry farming households of Ananthapuramu district of Andhra Pradesh.
Type of the 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 Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes, it is important to know Socio-economic factors of dry farming households in Ananthapuramu district	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, as I think the title of manuscript must be re-arrange accordingly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title: Analysis of Socio-economic factors on dry farming households in Ananthapuramu district The words intitled on the title of activity, those are “household income and risk aversion behaviors” must be avoid from the title, because they are projected and answered by objectives. 	Suggesion on the title of the manuscript has been considered and has been changed.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	➤ Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, subsections and structure of the manuscript must be re-arranged. Eg: There is no any description of the study area and climatic data of Ananthapuramu district. Section number 3.1, 3.2,...3.5 then, the next (6. Average size of Operational Holding) instead of 3.6. Section number 3.6 is instead of (3.7 Asset position) and also the arrangement of subsection start from 3.5 to 3.13 have to be re-arranged again. 	Climatic data of Ananthapuramu district has been included. Numbering of section numbers has been corrected accordingly.
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	➤ No rather miner correction	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	➤ No almost the reference citations are recent	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In any research work introduction part is the vital point to express the work. So the introduction part is too weak to introduce the research work. The other points to be considered are, expressing considering to the work; reacts as world, continent and country then to specific of the study area expression. Therefore, there are such points. The other point is the statement of the problem. In any research manuscript, statement of the problem is one of the vital points to be indicator of the research what going to be solved and due to what problem, this activity to be done. So there is no any indicator to be done this activity. The last comment is in the last section that in conclusion part: As I think it no enough siting only conclusion rather than siting recommendation. Whenever one research finalizes, conclusion has to be sited and then the recommendation has to be followed in order to fit the gap by your finding technologies. In PART 4 of this guideline has a problem. Eg (>9-10), (>8-9)...(>0-3) thus must be _(<9-10), (<8-9)...(<0-3) 	Introduction part is improvised Statement of the problem has been included.

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	