

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 <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 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.	I don't like this manuscript because where the abstract and keywords suggest that the above article is on the Agricultural Research and Extension Service of India, the case studies discuss the subject in countries other than India, which I find irrelevant. For this reason, if a comparative discussion had been made here, the matter would have been confirmed. The article does not show a literature review where many bibliographies are provided unnecessarily. Most of the tables used in the article are not author's own, Copied from various places and not properly cited as source.	
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 addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It is comprehensive but need to modify.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, need to modify.	
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.	There are a lot of irrelevant bibliography. In the methodology quantitative and qualitative two types of methods are unclear and not discussed in detail. Most of the tables used in the article are not author's own, Copied from various places and not properly cited as source.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -	There are a lot of irrelevant references.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	Use the proper sources of Tables/Figures.	

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:	Deepanjana Halder Majumder
Department, University & Country	Jadavpur University, India