

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127108
Title of the Manuscript:	Reconsidering Extension Advisory Services for Rural Livelihood Security
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community, particularly those working in the fields of agricultural development and rural policy-making. It offers a comprehensive meta-analysis of Agricultural Extension Advisory Services (EAS), which play a crucial role in disseminating agricultural knowledge and improving farming practices. By identifying key factors influencing the effectiveness of EAS and highlighting the gap in research on Agricultural and Rural Credit, the manuscript provides valuable insights that can guide future policy development and agricultural interventions. The focus on data-driven recommendations is a strong point, as it presents evidence-based solutions for enhancing EAS outcomes and addressing the financial challenges faced by farmers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is generally comprehensive, offering a clear summary of the study's objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions. A brief mention of the study's implications for policy-makers would help emphasize the practical significance of the findings. A minor addition of these details could strengthen the abstract and provide readers with a more complete understanding of the study's contribution.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate for the subject matter. The use of a clear distinction between the Objective, Study Design, Methodology, Results, and Conclusion ensures that the reader can follow the logical flow of the research. The inclusion of an introductory section to highlight the relevance of EAS and its impact on agriculture is also a positive feature.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound. The use of meta-analysis to synthesize findings from various studies on Agricultural Extension Advisory Services (EAS) is a strong methodological approach that enhances the reliability and generalizability of the conclusions. Additionally, the identification of key factors (EAS Purpose, Strategies, Process, and Product) provides a structured framework for understanding the complexities of agricultural extension services. The study's emphasis on policy-making and addressing the gap in agricultural credit research further adds to its practical value, showing that the research is grounded in real-world needs.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references used in the manuscript appear to be sufficient, but there could be an opportunity to include more recent studies, especially those published within the last 2-3 years, to ensure the research reflects the latest advancements in the field.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the manuscript are generally suitable for scholarly communications. The writing is clear and concise, with a professional tone appropriate for an academic audience. However, there are a few areas where sentence structures could be improved for better readability. For example, some sentences are complex and could benefit from being broken down into shorter, more digestible parts. Overall, the language is acceptable, but slight improvements in sentence flow and grammar would help to refine the manuscript for publication.	
Optional/General comments	NA	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ananya Mitra
Department, University & Country	United School of Business Management, India