

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_110490
Title of the Manuscript:	Market Efficiency and price spread in Jaipur district
Type of the Article	Original Scientific Paper

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, the manuscript has the potential of acting as a guide for future studies if the observations pointed out are addressed 2. The title do not look to be suitable, judging from the fact that it is not specific on the particular food or item it wants to address. Also, the introduction does not address the topic – the introduction focused more on the production of pulses, neglecting the key aspects of the topic, that is, market efficiency and price spread. The writer may need to address the “Introduction”. The title do not address the issue of Market efficiency as spelt out. An alternative title would be “Price Spread of Chickpea in Jaipur District” 3. The abstract is comprehensive 4. Yes, they are appropriate 5. Based on my opinion, I do not think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The researcher has a whole lot of convincing to do. Also, comments for the researcher were given in the main manuscript file. 6. The references ranges from 2011 – 2020, with one 1991 reference listed.	Revised
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The researcher may need to give the manuscript to someone who is vast in English Language to assist with editing. There is no proper use of punctuation marks by the writer.	Done
Optional/General comments	Comments to aid the author were given in the main manuscript file	

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)	