

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This is a very interesting and complete review article about Participatory Approaches to Agricultural Research and Extension Services. It is well written with abundant updated bibliography and clear conclusions and future directions</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>It is suitable.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>It is comprehensive and it is not necessary to add more points</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>It is very appropriate</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The article provides on overview of Participatory Research worldwide, with emphasis on Asia and Africa with updated and reliable bibliographic sources and a structure that makes it pleasant to read.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>Thats OK</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is suitable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:	Eduardo Roberto Wright
Department, University & Country	Buenos Aires University, Argentina