

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_99944
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of WhatsApp messages on knowledge gain of sugarcane cultivation practices among the farmers
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>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No clear description on the background of the study, which explains the current state/scenario on the agricultural, particularly the sugarcane industry in Athani taluk of Belagavi District in Karnataka state. - No clear statement on the current research problem gap faced in the pertaining studies. - No research questions, research objectives and research hypotheses - No in-dept review of past studies pertaining to the studies - Insufficient of past studies reviewed and referenced for this study - Vague explanation on the research methodology such as the respondents' criteria, respondents' size, area of study (Athani taluk of Belagavi District in Karnataka state), method of analysis etc. No reasons provided for each of the chosen tools and methods for the study - No clear presentation on the information for the types of items in the research tool. - The analysis is on the mean and differences in mean. No interpretation on the meaning of the results, mostly just stating it without much interpretation of its meaning to this study - Need to have clear discussion on how the results obtained can be used to narrow the current research gap 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Chiam CC
Department, University & Country	Open University Malaysia, Malaysia