

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_111244
Title of the Manuscript:	Does Maize Cultivation is Profitable in Tamil Nadu-Economics of Maize cultivation in Western Zone of Tamil Nadu
Type of the Article	RESEARCH ORIGINAL

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>Yes, the author is highlighting the maize cultivation and its profitability which can further assist in uptake of the maize cultivation in the region</p> <p>Title can be reframed as “Economic analysis of Maize cultivation in Western Zone of Tamil Nadu”</p> <p>Abstract need to be refined. Focus on result part, discuss on the different costs of Maize cultivation</p> <p>Introduction: This part requires certain attention. The structure needs to be followed like Maize crop global status and its uses, India status and utility of maize crop in country, reduction in price or consumption with possible reasons. Problem statement part in introduction is weak.</p> <p>Sentences can be reframed for better clarity. Review: Author needs to reframe the review either based on year of the study or global, national studies to maintain the uniformity. Author can reduce the information part from review and focus on major highlights. Methodology: Sample size is different for all reason, provide justification Table 1 Result: Results can also be discussed cost components wise like C1 C2 cost if possible. Share of various costs in production can be shown through appropriate graph.</p> <p>Yes, the methodology followed is correct.</p> <p>This part needs to be reframed, add more references and follow the standard method.</p> <p>Author needs to highlight the recommendation if any from the study for policy making.</p>	<p>This is part of the article.</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Changed</p> <p>Added</p>
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It can be improved with short sentences and precise writing.</p>	<p>Changed</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	