

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_97156
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Rythu Bharosa Kendras (RBKs) services as perceived by farmers in East Godavari 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Suitable  2. Effectiveness of Rythu Bharosa Kendras (RBKs) services as perceived by farmers in East Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh. In may be replaced with of  3. Yes  4. Yes  5. Yes, however there was lots of scope in improving the expression of the findings  6. More supporting studies may be added. Reference needs to be mentioned properly in the text and arranged accordingly.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Grammatical errors should be corrected. Correct punctuation should be used to express the right meaning of the sentences.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Scientifically correct, but needs improvement in language	

### 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:	Mayuri Bora
Department, University & Country	College of Community Science, Assam Agricultural University, India