

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_110149
Title of the Manuscript:	ATTITUDE EXTENT OF FARMERS TOWARDS FPOs IN EASTERN UTTAR PRADESH
Type of the Article	

### 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. 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The author presented a well-written manuscript important for scientific community and to other readers.</p> <p>2. Title of the manuscript would have been written as "ATTITUDE EXTENT OF FARMERS TOWARDS FARMERS PRODUCER ORGANIZATIONS (FPOS) IN EASTERN UTTAR PRADESH, INDIA"</p> <p>3. The objective of the study should be mentioned in the abstract of the article to be comprehensive. Also, the abstract is too brief and the sentence "The average mean of scores of attitude observed to be 58.72 with a range of minimum 40 and maximum 74" is incomplete.</p> <p>4. subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. Materials used and area of the study should be highlighted under methodology by the author(s)</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, it is too brief. The author(s) should expand the text.</p> <p>6. The references in text are insufficient, outdated and are not found in the reference list. Also, all the citations which are current in the reference list have not been captured in the text (vice- visa) The author should site appropriately to attract other researchers</p> <p>7. OVERALL, the paper is well-written and easy to follow, but the authors should consider improving some sections to enhance the clarity and organization of the paper.</p> <p>8. The author should discuss the result referring to his findings. Table 1 = 3. Example: this is in agreement to the findings of, (Handy <i>et al</i>; 2023). Also. is similar to the findings of, (.....<i>et al</i>; 2022).</p> <p>9. Please include the authors' <i>orcid id</i> in the revised copy. He can register for an <i>orcid id</i> for free via <a href="https://orcid.org">https://orcid.org</a>.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language used is easy to follow and the quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications and other Researchers</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>GOOD</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>Omar Abdullahi Wafudu Handy</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria</b>