



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_46009
Title of the Manuscript:	SWOT Analysis of Large Cardamom in Ilam District, 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>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sampling method and sample size has not been discussed in methodology part Need, purpose of the study is not visible Results must be given more concrete based on previous findings and background Lines 72, 94 to 100, 158 to 200 (Grammatical mistakes in sentences must be corrected) Table 12 check values again (eg see first rating value) All references must be in same style (example check 2,5,13th references) Add future scope and limitations part. Conclusion and recommendations part must be separate. Objectives of the study are not visible. The paper needs to be refined further in terms of findings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sampling method and sample size has been revisited and corrected and given green colour. Need and purpose of the study has been spelled out and given green colour. We corrected line 72, 94, 100, 158, and 200 corrected and indicated by green colour. There are only 4 tables in the manuscript and there are no table 12. Even though we check all the value in the tables. All reference revisited and corrected accordingly. Conclusion and recommendation has been separated as suggested in 4 and 5. The objectives of the study again revisited and spelled out. Acknowledge part added. The whole manuscript has been refined as per the suggestion made by reviewer.
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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no ethical issues in this manuscript