



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_43484
Title of the Manuscript:	Status of bodichitta (Ziziphus buddhensis) cultivation and its prospects in Nepal
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Title of Manuscript: "Status of bodichitta (Ziziphus buddhensis) cultivation and its prospects in Nepal" The study is quite interesting but I have these few comments to make; The abstract of this study needs some modifications. You may need to include some salient ingredients of a real abstract in a concise and precise manner. These include; some major findings of this study, information about the study area, methodology employed (sampling procedures etc), conclusion among others. You may also need to reduce this abstract, it is somehow long. In the introduction, you may need to start with the subject matter and not with the demographic characteristics of the study area. Author(s) may need to check the introduction and start it in line 59 and delete previous ones appropriately. In materials and methods, the data analysis section needs some modifications. You may need to add salient information about the tools of analysis employed for this study like multiple regression and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). You may need to present implicit and explicit functions of the model you intended using like the dependent variable names and signs and the independent variables too. Also, the tables on the results of this analysis need some formatting. The figure 2 (line 66) presented was somehow unclear. Moreover, in the results and discussion, the author(s) did not compare the findings in this study with the already existing ones in the literature to validate their results in relation to this study's findings or refute it. Authors did not show the results of the ANOVA used for this study. You may also add the map of your study area in this manuscript to add colour to your work. The conclusion section should rather be "conclusion and Recommendations" or you may present them separately. You may need to present your recommendations in flowing sentences with no bullet points or numbering. You may present it in paragraphs. Authors need to adhere to the journal's guideline on referencing because there are some corrections to be done in this section. The study utilized some recent and relevant references but may need to add more especially in the aspect of results and discussion section as earlier mentioned. To really give scientific validations on the research findings in this study.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	All the minor revision comments are already given in the original manuscript.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Nil	
----------------------------------	-----	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Olutosin A. Otekunrin</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Federal University of Agriculture, Nigeria</i>