

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_98644</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Comparative study on effectiveness of programmed instruction and lecture method on cognitive domain of extension functionaries</b>
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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>
<b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b> <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	The manuscript is important to the scientific research. It is good structured and contains important information for the scientific community.  The title is well chosen.  The abstract makes a good presentation of what is to be analyzed.  The manuscript is good structured.  My opinion is that it is scientifically appropriate.  The references are sufficient.  Even the period of the study is a little bit old, because the experimentation was done during 2013-14 in the Staff Training Unit of University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore, it is still interesting for the scientific community.	
<b>Minor REVISION comments</b> <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English language is well used.	
<b>Optional/General comments</b>	Good for publishing.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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>
<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>Tonea Elena</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Life Sciences, Romania</b>