Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_84818**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Current status and marketing of fruits and vegetables in India**
Type of the Article	

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

(https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.6

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	**The abstract should be concise and informative. It should briefly describe the purpose of the work, techniques and methods used, major findings with important data and conclusions. The author only presents the results in his abstract, using terms such as "has been". Terms like these are very subjective, making it impossible for the author to define the period under analysis. Other phrases also refer to the sense of actuality, but the data presented are not accompanied by the analyzed period.** **The introduction section provides a factual background and a brief literature survey, but I could not find a clearly defined problem, proposed solution, and the scope and justification of the work done.** **There is no "MATERIAL AND METHODS / EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS / METHODOLOGY" sections. If the article is a literature review, it can be briefly described in the introduction. For this case, I see no need for this detailed section.** **On the other hand, if the research used any other more detailed methodology, it is necessary to have a specific section describing the research, data collection and analysis.** **The discussion presented in some sections is very interesting, presents a coherence between the themes and makes the reading pleasant. However, I am unable to assess whether the research achieved its objective, as it is not clearly described in the text of the work.** **The presentation of references does not follow the author's guidelines. It appears to be in APA formatting. However, the journal has its own formatting style.**	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
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?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Paula Cristina Pedroso Moi**
Department, University & Country	**Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso and Centro Universitário Avantis, Brazil**