

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJAEES_118075
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio-economic, Socio-personal and Demographic Profiling of KVK-based Vermicompost Training Participants: Evidence from Bihar, India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy> )

### 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Very important to the community because it advocates for use of all biodegradable wastes which are found in the local areas and turning them into vermicomposting which enriches soils.</li> <li>2. "Effectiveness of vermicomposting in increasing farm productivity".</li> <li>3. No. it is lacking reasons why this research was necessary, it lacks research design adopted, lacks conclusion and recommendation.</li> <li>4. All are appropriate except, I would recommend that what has informed this work should come out clearly in its own subsection instead of combining it with introduction. The subsection should read..."The statement of the problem under investigation"</li> <li>5. It is scientifically correct because the lay out respects other research works. Research design should read...cross sectional survey design</li> <li>6. References are adequate, relevant and current</li> </ol>	
<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>	-Appropriate	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	-Generally good scholarly work with originality backing.	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>John Oloo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology (JOOUST), Kenya</b>