

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_99612
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON THE TRAINING NEEDS OF VETERINARY OFFICERS WORKING IN 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)
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. 7. Reference problems 8. Problems with the manner of expressing ideas in the text and technical editing (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	relatively yes yes yes relatively ok The citations in the main text of the paperwork are dubious, either they are inserted out of place, in the wrong place, or they are put just to be more references. This must be clarified! The text has long sentences, unintelligible expression and technical editing mistakes (capital or small letters where they should not, etc). See the attachment	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	hardly	
Optional/General comments	the paperwork could be published, after a very serious revision and clarification of the citations.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Magdalin Leonard Dorobat
Department, University & Country	University of Pitesti, Romania