

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_103931
Title of the Manuscript:	A Conceptual Framework to Revitalize Indian Agricultural Education System for Strengthening Agri Startups and Entrepreneurs
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)
<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>The manuscript had a importance for scientific community and it refers to <b>Strengthening Agri Startups and Entrepreneurs</b></p> <p>The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive</p> <p>Introduction - Limited research is presented moderately relevant and will make a nominal contribution to the field. Need some figures or statistics to support the study. Sound work which expresses a coherent position only in broad terms and in uncritical conformity to one or more standard views of the topic.</p> <p>LR - Inadequate knowledge of the relevant literature. Attempt to construct a coherent argument, but may suffer loss of focus and consistency, with issues at stake stated only vaguely, or theoretical mode(s) couched in simplistic terms. Overall, Literature review part need to be improved.</p> <p>The references are not sufficient (only 13) and not recent. There are no bibliographic sources from the last 2 years. How can we talk about Agricultural Education System without bringing bibliographic sources from recent years, it is not possible that the newest reference about Agricultural Education System is from 2021!? Recommend introduction of new and bibliographic sources, from 2021-2023 years.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The quality of English language must be improved. Since the authors do not appear to be native English speakers, I suggest a comprehensive revision of the English language and style for the entire article using Grammarly or another specialized tool</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Research Methodology/Sample size/Justification for Hypothesis/ Analysis &amp; interpretation are totally missing. It seems it's a secondary study even though not supported by literature.</p>	

[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>Naresh Sachdev</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>PCTE Group of Institutes Ludhiana, India</b>