

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_91697
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge level of mango orchardists in relation to different practices of mango in Meerut Districts Uttar Pradesh
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:

(<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The article entitled "Knowledge level of mango orchardists in relation to different practices of mango in Meerut Districts Uttar Pradesh", has as its main objective, to assess the current state of two mango pomaristas as the level of knowledge, objective two manga orchardists in relation to different practices developed. The article in the questão should be improved in all of its body, trying to delve more into the matter addressed in a more specific, objective and direct way, or summarized and informative, because it is confusing, I should better clarify the objectives to be achieved, disbelieving better the methodologies and results; Note-I know that its theoretical reference must be updated by the most updated reference of 2015, another point to be observed is the statistical analysis of two data, because no material and methods do not exist at this point; As a final analysis, it seems unfavorable for its publication as it is, I suggest making the requested alterations for a new analysis.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Antônio Vitor Machado
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Rural Do Semi-Árido – UFERSA, Brasil