

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_114826
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio-economic and Psychological characteristics of KVK trainees and non-trainees in selected districts of Jharkhand
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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes the manuscript is important to the scientific community in the conceptualization of the research idea: of attempting to characterize and do comparison of two farming capability groups as the KVK trainees and those none trainees in wheat and mushroom farming in Selected Districts of Jharkhand, India. The researcher did not explicitly put the objective forward for pursuing so that the final conclusions in section 15 of Table 1 were evidently not captured regarding the two farming groups. Evidently the trainees performed better than their non trainee contemporaries.</p> <p>2. The title should be slightly modified to : "Assessment of Socio-economic and Psychological Characteristics of KVK Wheat and Mushroom Farmer Trainees and Non-trainees in Selected Districts of Jharkhand, India "</p> <p>3. The abstract failed to depict distinctively the scientific flow of the research process with a key highlight of failing to declare the outcome of section 15 of Table 1 .</p> <p>4. The manuscript is scientifically correct with the researcher dwelling a lot on characteristics outcomes in section 1 to 14 of Table 1 and failed to give the most important output of section 15 .</p> <p>5. References in the discussion are limited to not more than 1 and being characterised as scanty despite the compilation of references being rich on the similar work elsewhere.</p> <p>6. References are relatively sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is good for this scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>None</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:	Aggrey W,Wanjala
Department, University & Country	Kenya