

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_112002
Title of the Manuscript:	Mushroom cultivation MOOC at Kerala Agricultural University: Garrett Ranking Analysis of Constraints to enhance Online agriculture learning
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study is important to re-evaluate MOOC courses based on the feedback provided by the participants. This would enable MOOC course providers to develop a more effective and successful learning platforms. 2. The title reflects the objective of the study. 3. The objective is not clear. Barriers to mushroom growing or learning mushroom growing? The results mentioned in the abstract was too lengthy and descriptive. It can be written in a few sentences briefly. The abstract end abruptly with a lengthy results description. Mention that this study offers suggestions/solutions to..... 4. The sub-sections of the manuscript need to be restructured. Section 1 – Introduction is too brief. Introduction is recommended to provide a wide global view about MOOC. In this section you should also highlight the statement of problem. If Literature review is not included as a section, you may want to include a review of previous studies briefly and highlight the gap/problem/scope clearly. <p>-Section 2 should be called Methodology. Structure methodology section clearly – research design, participants, data collection, analysis. The second and third paragraphs in Section 2 seems to be a repetition.</p> <p>-Garret Ranking method should be explained more clearly. Justify why this method was selected for data analysis. Support your justification by citing previous studies which has utilized this method of data analysis.</p> <p>-Section 3 – lack of critical discussion. Discussion of results is too short. The findings are merely summarised without any critical discussion or literature support. Please provide argumentation, debate, or writer's Points of Departure (PoD). Discussion should consist of ideas from other scholars and the writer's opinion/view/perspective about the topic. Please add more discussion</p> <p>-After analysis of results are written, the relevant data (Table 1/2/3) should be followed. However, Table 1 – 3 is placed at the end of the section in this paper.</p> <p>-Data presented in Table 1- 3 is does not reflect Garret Ranking Analysis clearly. Include Garret score, total score, mean score and finally the rank. Explain the Garret Ranking Analysis more clearly.</p> <p>-Suggestions/Implications is written in a narrative manner. It can be put into a different section and presented in a table.</p> <p>-The chapter concludes abruptly. Revise the ending to provide readers with clear takeaways or implications.</p> <p>-Providing only 2 references are unacceptable...study and cite more related and current papers in your study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Proofreading is recommended.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	In general the manuscript needs to be revised and made necessary changes. The content is acceptable but the way the manuscript was written must be improved. After the revision, it is suggested to be reviewed again before publication.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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:	S. Thivviah Sanmugam
Department, University & Country	Politeknik Banting, Malaysia

Review Form 1.7