



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_47481
Title of the Manuscript:	ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF MAJOR FARMING SYSTEMS IN HYDERABAD-KARNATAKA
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:

(<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	<p>1. Important parts or sections of a research paper, such as the objectives of the study, the methods used and the discussion of results, were not presented in the main text of the paper. (The objectives and the methods were actually mentioned in the Abstract.)</p> <p>2. State the objectives of the study at the last part of the Introduction.</p> <p>3. Provide a section for "Methods" after the "Introduction" and before the "Results".</p> <p>4. Provide a section for "Discussion" after the presentation of "Results". Discuss the present findings in the light of the previous findings of relevant literature.</p> <p>5. The conclusions should be based the findings or results of the study and should correspond to the presented objectives of the study. (Note that the word "CONCLUSION" as title of Section 3 was also misspelled as "CONLUSION". Be extra careful next time.)</p> <p>6. Look for more references and cite them properly in the main text of the paper. Note that all and only those references cited in the text should be included in the list of references at the end of the paper. Hence, the reference "Ramesh 2016" cited in the Introduction should be included in the "References" while all those references listed (Bhowmick et al. 1992; Devi 2006; Kumar et al. 2006; Manjunatha et al. 2013 and Singh & Joshi 2008) that were not cited in the text should be deleted or excluded from the "References".</p>	Thank you for your comments. The manuscript has been modified thoroughly following your suggestive comments.
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)	



SDI Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>