

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_103666
Title of the Manuscript:	Experiences of Millet FPOs with ICAR-IIMR Millet Model
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No. I suggest to modify the topic as "Experiences of Millet FPOs by ICAR-IIMR in the Southern States"</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>1. As this study mentioned that it is based on primary data accessed millet farmers. But, not clearly stated total number of sample size, sampling distribution and sampling technique. Author has to complete the necessary details.</p> <p>2. Author has given number of abbreviations for agencies in the part of methodology. But It should be expected in the necessary phase.</p> <p>3. Author just given only two states Talangana and Karnataka for the study analysis. But, in the part of results and discussion, stated two more states. So, it should be justified in the part of methodology.</p> <p>4. Sources of tables are not given.</p> <p>5. The study has not analysed data but the given in this study seems like secondary data presented with necessary graphics.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. As this study mentioned that it is based on primary data accessed millet farmers. But, not clearly stated total number of sample size, sampling distribution and sampling technique. Author has to complete the necessary details.</p> <p>2. There is no statistical details of primary data and it's analysis.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N. Sreedevi
Department, University & Country	Arumugam Pillai Seethai Ammal College, Alagappa University, India