

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_126332
Title of the Manuscript:	AN ANALYSIS OF MARKETING STATUS OF BT COTTON SEED IN DEVBHUMI DWARKA DISTRICT
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	Marketing studies are very important in research; this paper however will contribute to the existing knowledge in terms of marketing issues in agriculture. I found the paper and the title interesting.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes but with minor correction: AN ANALYSIS OF MARKETING STATUS OF <i>BT</i> COTTON SEED IN DEVBHUMI DWARKA DISTRICT (let the author state the country from which the research was conducted)..	
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 was comprehensive but I suggested the addition and deletion of some aspects of the abstract. The author should look at the major corrections on the Abstracts and correct them	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 manuscript is scientifically and technically okay. But with major corrections to make the article more sound	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	I suggested the addition of more references in most especially the introductory part of the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments	The English is yes suitable for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is good for publication but with major corrections.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Garba Ibrahim Danmaidawo
Department, University & Country	Nigerian Institute for Oil-Palm Research (NIFOR), Nigeria