

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_95075
Title of the Manuscript:	AWARENESS, PREFERENCES, PERCEPTION, AND SATISFACTION ABOUT THE OVER-THE-TOP (OTT) PLATFORMS/PLAYERS IN ANAND CITY, GUJARAT
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:

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

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>The manuscript is for Social community</b></p> <p>2. <b>Title has no objection</b></p> <p>3. <b>In abstract, on what basis wrote the result the clarity is need</b></p> <p>4. <b>Sub sections and structure of the manuscript is not appropriate.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Researcher gave number 3.2 Research design, what is 3.1.</li> <li>• Table numbers starting from 2.1 but these number are coming under 3.1, so may be table numbers are 3.1, 3.2... like.</li> </ul> <p>5. <b>Manuscript is scientifically not correct.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If any research work Hypothesis is most important, but in this manuscript no hypothesis.</li> <li>• No suggestions in this script, suggestions are must in research work.</li> <li>• Researcher mentioned weighted Average Mean in research design head, but not apply the tool in this study. without applying any statistical tool correct result is impossible to give. so it is scientifically being not correct.</li> </ul> <p>6. <b>References is not a major problem, better to concentrate and settle the remaining above mentioned points.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	No Objection	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Review of literature is require	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>T. Lokeswara Rao</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Management Studies, GIET University, India</b>