

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_118868
Title of the Manuscript:	A study on different AKIS actors on agricultural knowledge and information dissemination
Type of the Article	

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, it is important for the scientific community. This manuscript presents a framework for determining the linkage depth and strength between different actors within a geographical location in the area of Agricultural Knowledge, and all of the services that depend on it, such as production, supply, loan schemes, etc.</p> <p>Yes, it is suitable. At the discretion of the Author, an alternative might also be something that specifies that the paper looks at the linkage between the different AKIS actors.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and provides a good framework for what to expect from the article.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>I consider the manuscript to be scientifically correct, in that it explains the methodology used to arrive at the obtained results. Since the article seems to use primary data obtained from officials in Jalpaiguri, West Bengal, it is difficult to replicate the data but that is to be expected, as it is understandable, since the Author is working with novel information.</p> <p>The references appear to be sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Minor observations: In the reference [9], there is a space " " lacking from the Cooch Behar District of "West Bengal. ; In the reference [11], the word "retrieved" is missing a letter "e".</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Monica Ocnean</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Life Sciences "King Mihai I", Timisoara, Romania</b>