# **Review Form 3**

| Journal Name:            | Asian Research Journal of Agriculture  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_ARJA_126401   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | ANALYSIS OF CONSTRAINTS FACED IN THE Bt COTTON SEED MARKET IN DEVBHUMI DWARKA DISTRICT |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article  |

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 3 (07-07-2024)

# **Review Form 3**

## **PART 1:** Review Comments

| Compularity DEVICION comments   | Povinuor's comment   | Author's Foodbook /Diagos servest the manuscript and highlight that  |
|---|--|--|
| <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments   | Reviewer's comment   | Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.                        | The study or paper is very important firstly, for all cotton producers, cotton dealers, experts and others stakeholders who participate directly or indirectly in cotton industries.   |  |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  | It looks important   |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.   | The abstract is very smart and also inclusive of all parts at some level. It all also well summarized.   |  |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  | Of course yes, but some levels are missed (shallow review of related concepts).  E.g. some parts are also missed from manuscript like, citations of specific sources (vague to get some clue like who said this and that) on the body, background is also too short, |  |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The paper followed scientific procedure; it follows coherences and has its own output. The authors at least tried to meet their objectives,  |  |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.   | Some are recent and others are old, in even if they are not cited on the body part.  |  |
| Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?  | It is good   |  |
| Optional/General comments   | I suggest the authors take some time to revisit the papers to incorporate aforementioned comments, citations and sourcing including his/her/their own results or findings.   |  |
|   |  |  |

# 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) |   |

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 3 (07-07-2024)

# **Review Form 3**

# **Reviewer Details:**

| Name:                            | Alemayehu Bashe Bade   |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Department, University & Country | South Ethiopia Agricultural Research Institute, Areka Agricultural Research Center, Ethiopia |

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 3 (07-07-2024)