

Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_120123
Title of the Manuscript:	Extension Methods Used For Dissemination and Constraints Faced By The Extension Personnel and Farmers In Paddy-Wheat Residue Management
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 **Jack 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 1.8](#)

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>
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	The subject covered is important for the study area. The authors of the study randomly selected a representative number of subjects, in relation to the problem addressed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is appropriate, in relation to the topic addressed	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The article Abstract is comprehensive and the keywords are representative of the article topic	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The introduction is supported by a few bibliographic sources. More extensive documentation would be appropriate.	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	I appreciate that the article is scientifically correct. The authors captured the problem addressed, obtained objective answers from the surveyed subjects, and adequately interpreted the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The introduction is supported by a few bibliographic sources. More extensive documentation would be appropriate.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.8](#)

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:	Florin Sala
Department, University & Country	University of Life Sciences "King Mihai I" from Timisoara, Romania