

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_120365
Title of the Manuscript:	Participatory Approaches to Agricultural Research and Extension Services
Type of the Article	Review 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	As bottom up approach is commonly advised for effective participation and implementation of project, this manuscript is important for scientific community in applying the various methods of Participatory Rural Appraisal.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate .	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript lack critical analysis of the references referred. It is just like linking one author to another based on the subsections themes. The authors added Tables , Figures directly quoted from other authors. Instead of this, Table or Figure can be prepared by analysing all the related references. The paper is lengthy. The author should put own perspective on the topic based on the evaluation of the available references.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Sufficient references had been cited in the manuscript. However, Martin Lengwiler, Christophe Bonnevil, Gonsalves J, T. Becket etc, can be included for understanding the evolution of PRA in Science and Technology.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is lengthy and needs improvement in critical analysed of the references cited.	

Review Form 3

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:	Chandam Victoria Devi
Department, University & Country	India