

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_95490
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors constraining Farmer's adoption of the E-National Agriculture Market (eNAM) in Sultanpur District of Uttar Pradesh
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. The content of manuscript is good and contribute to the local community. 2. The title of manuscript is fine. 3. Author can use the limitations and or problem statements as introduction for the abstract. "to analysis the constraints....." (analysis is used for analyzing the relationship) or " to identify....." Are these the theme developed from the overall findings? Author should include the implications (managerial & theoretical) 4. Author should prepare the literature review for the manuscript. Also, ensure that the results of the study should separate from the discussions. 5. Yes. 6. The listed references are not enough and majority of articles are too old. (I left all the specific comments in the softcopy.)	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Winnie Wong Poh Ming
Department, University & Country	School of Business and Management, University of Technology Sarawak, Malaysia