

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_96518
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of socio-personal and management factors to generate the knowledge level of the farmers associated with sericulture of West Bengal, India.
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)
<p>Compulsory 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This mathematical language is interesting, but it says nothing about the object and purpose of the study. To review. Translating all this into the studied context, what is allowed to be inferred? Consult the journal's rules. References and citations must be standardized. In the case of numerical order, this must be ascending and not start with the number 5 Update references with publications from the last five years. Outdated theoretical framework. The methods should be better detailed: 1 - Type of study? 2 - Where were the participants approached and how? 3 - Ethical issues (mandatory to have gone through an ethics committee); 4 - Data collection instruments used? type; already validated instruments? 5 - Measured variables; 6 - Statistical treatment prior to data analysis The results and discussion section should be rewritten: 1 - The mathematical results must be translated as to their meanings for the context of the study/theme studied; 2 - The discussion does not exist, it is not presented by the authors. Must be added. The results found must be contextualized with the scientific literature; The results suggest that the authors use a study topic as a basis to test a statistical protocol (which is not in the objective). What is expected is that a statistical protocol will be used as a tool to explore a database and obtain answers to study questions. To review</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This is a socially relevant study that makes important contributions to a better understanding of social factors. However, the manuscript must be restructured, with an update of the consulted literature, methodological detailing, restructuring of the results so that the meanings are highlighted and the discussion must be built, since it does not appear in the current version.</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Junir Antonio Lutinski
Department, University & Country	Unochapecó, Brazil