

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJAEES_102636 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Agricultural -News visibility in various Indian newspapers: A study |
| Type of the Article | |

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>The manuscript is very important because Agriculture is the backbone of the Indian economy and society, when There is a need to bring developmental agricultural news to inform about the developments in agriculture and allied fields.</p> <p>The title has to change, I suggest (Agricultural -News visibility in Indian newspapers: A comparative study)</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references aren't not sufficient but recent.</p> <p>- The researcher shouldn't chose the studied newspapers as a random selection but he have to choose them as the most circulated.</p> <p>- Keywords: the researcher repeat (print media), in addition he shouldn't put (RLBCAU studies) as a keyword.</p> <p>- Results: The researcher should put more convincing explanations for the results of his study.</p> <p>- References: the researcher didn't point to the numbers of pages.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(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)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Eman Metwally Mohamed Arafat |
| Department, University & Country | Modern University for Technology and Information, Egypt |