

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_95948
Title of the Manuscript:	An Insight into the Level of Technology Adoption of farmers of Jhelum Rice Variety in Kashmir Valley
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)	The article presents an important and current topic for agriculture in the world. The title is suitable. The abstract is sufficient, adequately presents the scope of the article and may be sufficient for other researchers who are looking for previous research results to be cited in newly emerging scientific works. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The article presents the appropriate scientific level. The results are presented in an understandable way. Conclusions were formulated correctly. References are definitely the weakness of the article. I suggest adding at least 6-7 items that will allow the author to compare his results with those of other researchers. Important: Between Fig. 2 and 4. Conclusion, a paragraph of commentary to own results and comparison with other available research results in the world should be added.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is understandable.	
Optional/General comments	The article presents a decent scientific level and can be published after taking into account the reviewer's 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iwona Pomianek
Department, University & Country	Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Poland