Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_86026**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Structural breaks and Growth and Instability in Onion cultivation: The case of Saurashtra Region of Gujarat**
Type of the Article	**Statistical Analysis/ Econometrics**

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	**Revise seriously the entire English of the paper** However, English of this paper is rather poor, with a lot of errors, some of which are making some phrases and some messages in this paper almost not understandable: 1) Page 2: "methods" not: "methodos" 2) Page 2: "The study period was classified" not: "The study period was also be classified" 3) Page 2: "The districts were selected" not "The districts was selected" 4) Page 2: "for each period" not "for two periods" 5) Page 3: "In each regression" not: "Here in each regression" 6) Page 3: reformulate: "is that the variable must be equal", "as a proxy for technology", 7) Page 4, correct is: "were" not "was", "Here the number of parameters is", "following form", "Student's test", "was calculated using" 8) Page 5, correct is: "a test for structural change, that is to say an econometric test" 9) Page 6: reformulate: "In Chow test approach, run three regressions…" 10) Page 6: split and reformulate: "From the above table…was significant" 11) Page 7, correct is: "f value was 0.8000, which being less than…", "an insignificant result was found also, so there was no structural break in …", "in the whole period", "reveals that at least", "variables", "among the factors considered" "presence of a structural change" 12) Page 8, correct is: "has apparently increased", "this data shows", "mean value", "area of… ha", "yield of…", "respectively 29.80 tons" 13) Reformulate: "The effect of beta coefficient…trend" 14) Correct: "was found significant", "was used to measure instability", "was lower as compared" 15) Reformulate: "In this most desirable situation…" 16) Correct: "both districts come…", split and correct: "Therefore they need to be introspected…", "research proves helpful" 17) Based also on the errors stated above, check the entire paper for other possible errors	
Minor REVISION comments	Based on the results of the statistical analysis, the paper makes only two suggestions for decision makers. The results of paper could be used to make much more suggestions and recommendations for farmers, scientists in agriculture and policy makers, in order to improve and increase agricultural production of onion	
Optional/General comments	This paper uses both descriptive and inferential statistics to calculate trends, structural break and to categorize, in order to analyze available data in the production of onion. The calculated coefficients and statistical indices used are relevant for the purpose of paper and are adequate and useful to describe, analyze and interpret both, results and input data. The statistical analysis is well done with a lot of useful explanations for both, methods used and interpretations of results. The statistical analysis uses a great variety of methods and synthetizes a big amount of data, which otherwise would have probably remained unused and not interpreted	

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:	**Catalin Silviu Nutu**
Department, University & Country	**Constanta Maritime University, Naval Academy "Mircea cel Batran", Romania**