

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_107258
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY OF ELECTRONIC RESOURCES OF AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY SPECIAL REFERENCE TO RAJASTHAN, INDIA
Type of the Article	General

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>	<p>No</p> <p>Use of e—resources in agricultural university libraries of Rajasthan</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>Not sufficient, recent from website which are collected in just two days in last week.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Ok</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Remarks of the reviewer:</p> <p>The title doesn't seem to make sense. The word 'of' in the title may be replaced with the word 'available'. The word university in the title must be plural as there are six universities under study. Abstract should communicate the central idea and contents of the paper. Title uses the concept 'electronic resources' whereas the body of the paper uses 'digital agricultural resources'. Introduction is too general. Necessity of the study does not show the necessity of the where is it represents necessity of the e-resources. In summary researcher has just rewritten the information collected from websites and other sources about the university, its library and available resources. There no uniformity in presentation of information. This paper cannot be said as a research paper as there is no any research. The manuscript is not sufficiently robust and technically sound. There is no suitability and technical standard of the methods. There is no question of sufficient details of the methods/process. The paper lacks in proper results, discussion, relevant and current references, and actual facts and figures.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <p>Researcher must think and decide what kind of paper he/she would like to write. Just finding availability of e-resources does not have any research value. Even if you want to write paper on availability of e-resources note down parameters and collect the data accordingly. You may find out</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	use of e-resources. Give meaningful title to the research paper. Find out and note down research problems, finalize objectives, hypotheses. Design questionnaire, collect data, present it through tables and figures, analyze, apply statistical test wherever essential and draw conclusions. Write paper in scientific language. Get proper guidance from experts for how to write paper. Best of luck	
--	---	--

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:	Jagdish Narharrao Kulkarni
Department, University & Country	Swami Ramanand Teerth Marathwada University, India