

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_98736
Title of the Manuscript:	Adoption of rice crop technology by ATMA farmers: constraints and remedies
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>More needs to improve in all parts of the article. (Authors use only one testing method. It may suggest that using an appropriate method in this study does not incorporate these tests as to the importance of this analysis. Authors should be clear about the methodology part.)</p> <p>The research area is interesting but the title is not attractive, improve it.</p> <p>More need for improvement in the abstract after major revision in the manuscript.</p> <p>No (In the methodology and data source part is not well written as per the standard format and needs to improve. The methodology should be improved regarding the study's objective and clearly mention all statistical tools used by authors in the exam's analysis part. Need each index to be rewritten by developing an Equation formula?)</p> <p>We think the manuscript is not properly scientifically correct and needs more improvement in the introduction, review literature, methodology, results, and conclusion parts.</p> <p>References are not written as per the cited standard.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sandeep Kumar Baliyan
Department, University & Country	Giri Institute of Development Studies, India