

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_103922
Title of the Manuscript:	Preseason Promotional and Extension Activities being Conducted by Research Seed Selling Seed Companies for the Hybrid Maize Crop
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>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>1. The paper is only about 5 sub-regions of an Indian state. The findings, even if they exist, would refer to India. However, the long title does not infer anything about India. 'Preseason Promotional and Extension Activities for the Indian Hybrid Maize Crop Market'</p> <p>2. Not at all. One can not understand the reason, findings and results of the study. Keyword: Extension Activities and Seed Companies for the Hybrid Maize Crop What would this keyword mean for researchers?</p> <p>3. The aggregate titles were used. But the content is far from being acceptable.</p> <p>4. The objective – processing and demonstration – results do not infer eligible scientific information. What is the objective? What are the findings/outputs?</p> <p>5. Very few and limited information resided on very few references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Not adequate and needs to be revisited. But firstly the paper needs to be reconsidered in a scientific manner.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper needs to be reconsidered. Nothing is clear</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rahmiye Figen Ceylan
Department, University & Country	Akdeniz University, Turkiye