Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_96266**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Upheaving Livelihood Avenues through Training: Assessment of knowledge domain as training effectiveness indicator**
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. I consider the article relevant in its theme, but it needs to be better written, with regard to the methodology used.** **2. The title is succinct and appropriate.** **3. The summary is too short. It does not cite the research methodology. Can be better written.** **4. The subsections explain the description of the paper well.** **5. The proposal of the article is interesting, but it is scientifically weak. It just presents itself as a large collection of compiled data.** **6. The bibliographic reference is very weak, not supporting the method used, nor the theoretical reference.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language meets the expectation.	
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)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Dacyr Dante de Oliveira Gatto**
Department, University & Country	**Universidade Nove de Julho, Brazil**