

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_96888
Title of the Manuscript:	CONSTRAINTS FACED BY RURAL WOMEN IN ADOPTION OF TECHNOLOGY: A STUDY CONDUCTED IN ASSAM
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. Yes it is important for scientific community. On the basis of the findings of study some educational/interventional programme can be conduct for increasing the level of adoption of technology. 2. ASSESSMENT OF CONSTRAINTS FACED BY RURAL WOMEN IN ADOPTION OF TECHNOLOGY, ASSAM 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. More recent reviews may be added and a same pattern in writing of reviews should be followed. There is also a mismatch in references and the review cited in text (Reference no.7). References should be arranged alphabetically.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is OK	
Optional/General comments	Good efforts by author	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kesar Chayal
Department, University & Country	University of Rajasthan, India