

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_100888
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge Of The Farmers Towards Recommended Jute Production Practices In Burdwan District Of West Bengal
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Manuscripts are important to the scientific community</p> <p>The title of the article is quite appropriate</p> <p>The abstract of the article is incomplete</p> <p>Subsections and the structure of the manuscript are not appropriate</p> <p>In my opinion the manuscript is scientifically lacking</p> <p>I don't think the references are enough even though they are up to date</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The quality of the language/English of the article is quite suitable for scientific communication</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. The abstract must be supplemented with theoretical and practical suggestions.</p> <p>2. Keywords: write about research variables</p> <p>3. The theory being tested must be presented in the content. The theoretical review in this research article is very weak.</p> <p>4. The bibliography is very lacking</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Christina Esti Susanti</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, Indonesia</b>