

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_102347
Title of the Manuscript:	CORRELATES OF PROFILE AND EXTENT OF ADOPTION OF CLUSTER FRONTLINE DEMONSTRATIONS (CFLDS) BENEFICIARY AND NON-BENEFICIARY FARMERS IN GROUNDNUT CONDUCTED BY KRISHI VIGYAN KENDRAS IN CHITTOOR DISTRICT OF ANDHRA 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The results of this research is important for further similar research.</li> <li>2, The ttle of article is too long; shortened it to maximum of 15 words.</li> <li>3.The abstract is comprehensive but need to be shortened to 150-200 words.</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</li> <li>5. Integrate "2.4. Objective of the study" with the statement of objective in introduction section. Avoid rewriting data in the text of the article that have been shown clearly on the tables,</li> <li>6. More intensive review of scientific articles for the references.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Prabowo Tjitropranoto</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>IPB University, Indonesia</b>