

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_100031
Title of the Manuscript:	Study Of Gaps In Adoption Of Improved Tasar Silkworm (Antheraea Mylitta.D) Rearing Technologies
Type of the 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>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>Instead of making separate point for the objectives, the introduction should end with the statement like (for example): Attempt has been planned to study the gaps in adoption of improved tasar silkworm rearing technologies and to identify the constraints in adoption and suggestions offered by the farmers.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>References are only seventeen. This section is appearing insufficient. At least twenty-five (total) references must be listed.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The text has been organized logically, flow smoothly, and "stick" together. In other words, everything in the writing is making sense to a reader.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>For consistency in the results, there should be repetition of the whole attempt (at least for three times). Collected data should be subjected for standard statistical analysis methods. These sections (especially, the mean, standard deviation, test of significance, references in this section) are not appearing in the manuscript.</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:	Vitthalrao B. Khyade
Department, University & Country	Sharadabai Pawar Mahila Mahavidyalaya, India