

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_111231
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF KISAN CALL CENTRE IN TIRUCHIRAPPALLI DISTRICT OF TAMIL NADU
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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>In some ways, the manuscript provided commendable results</p> <p>Rather</p> <p>Rather</p> <p>Rather</p> <p>Rather</p> <p>No, More than 79% of the references are less than 2020, while in scientific research usually more than 50% of them should be no less than the last three years from the completion of the research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The absence of other important variables, such as years of farm work.</p> <p>2. It is intended to make a comparison with individuals who do not use mobile phones to give more accurate results.</p> <p>3. The research did not clarify the total number of the research community, nor how the 90 farmers were identified.</p> <p>4. In recent research, the process of analysing results has moved from traditional tables to graphs, because they give a more comprehensive view of the process of showing and interpreting results.</p> <p>5. In interpreting the results, the variables were mentioned only in Table 4, while they were not referred to as in the rest of the research variables in Table 1.</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:	Samer Muhi Taha
Department, University & Country	Al- Qasim Green University, Iraq