

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_118553
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio-Economic Profile of KVK Staff and farmers for Utilization of ICT tools in Central Uttar Pradesh
Type of the Article	

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The title is suitable. However, the Initials – KVK – should be written in full</p> <p>Yes, but the title of the study should be mentioned.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The references are not recent. They should be updated to recent references. Discussions should compare and contrast other similar researches.</p> <p>In the main research article, I have made comments, using trackable systems, to further polish the article.</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>The research is good. It should be accepted for publication, once all the observed corrections are thoroughly effected.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nsa Akiba Ayi
Department, University & Country	University of Cross River State, Nigeria