

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_106639
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Socio-Economic Profile of the Rural Youth Trainees on Mushroom Production in the Western part of Uttar Pradesh</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only based on '**lack of Novelty**,' provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the 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 the Reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here.)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community?</b> (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript.)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not, please suggest an alternative title.)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them 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>Yes, manuscripts are significant to the scientific community.</p> <p>The title of the article is good (17 words) The abstract is good (172 words). A maximum abstract of 250 words is suggested to add the implications of the research results. Keywords are good (7 Words). Maximum keywords are five words. It is recommended to reduce them by selecting the most important keywords.</p> <p>The introduction, methods, and results are good. But it is recommended for discussion plus 1-2 references for each sub-discussion. The conclusion is good.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>References are good, Sufficient, and up-to-date references, and reference citations are recommended to use Mendeley IEEE or APA.</p> <p>It is suggested to add references as an example.</p> <p>Vishwakarma, N., Singh, D. K., Sharma, A., Tomar, A., &amp; Shukla, R. (2023). Impact of Skill development training on mushroom production in Madhya Pradesh District of Jabalpur.</p> <p>Rath, S. S., &amp; Mishra, S. N. (2023). Mushroom production and its discontinuance by the mushroom trainees in Odisha.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The quality of the article's English is suitable for scientific communication, but it is recommended to use grammarly.com</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The paper is Accepted but needs minor Revision.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Endang Noerhartati</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Wijaya Kusuma Surabaya, Indonesia</b>