

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_94979
Title of the Manuscript:	CONSERVATION AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGY: EXTENT OF ADOPTION & CONSTRAINTS FACED BY FARMERS OF MP
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes, it is, especially for the local one, supported to make the transition toward CA. 2. The title its appropriate, but please replace "MP" with "Madhya Pradesh (India)". 3. Abstract still need a sentence with real data, in order to support the papers' hypothesis. Also, please use "Happy Seeder" instead of "happy seeder" as a common noun. 4. The article has a good structure. 5. Yes, I think that the submitted paper has a good scientific background. 6. References are well mentioned and recent, but please take another look at the way they are written – I suggest to use „Aga Khan Report (2016)“ in all places, DWR Report (2017) and so on. 7. Please add a sentence with your own results in „Conclusions“, it's of real interest for the readers.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. English language is ok, but the entire paper needs another revision for additional or missing space; „%“ instead of „per cent“ all over the paper; wrong words and so on.	
Optional/General comments		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Berca Mihai
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania