

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_114063
Title of the Manuscript:	Extension and Technological Gap Analysis in Rice–Wheat Production System in Chhattisgarh Plain of Madhya Pradesh
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><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With proper modifications, the manuscript might provide useful reports of negative results that might necessitate further research, as such, it might be important for the scientific community</li> <li>Minor modifications to the title could be useful e.g. <b>Analysis of the Extension and Technological Gaps in Rice and Wheat Production Systems in Chhattisgarh Plain of Madhya Pradesh</b></li> <li>The abstract lacks some important information such as techniques &amp; methods used for data analysis and conclusion</li> <li>Some sections are not structured in accordance with the journal format e.g. the abstract lacks sub-sections, Tables are not presented within text as per journal format</li> <li>Yes, I think it is scientifically correct</li> <li>Most of the references are recent However, additional references to make the introduction robust enough but also to back up the findings for the present study could be useful</li> <li>Authors ought to ensure that their work is edited thoroughly, prior to submission to avoid obvious mistakes to do with grammar and punctuation marks</li> <li>More comments have been added in the manuscript, author may wish to check and address them</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The language in the submitted article is suitable but the authors might wish to improve the English quality to make it more suitable</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The paper needs serious revisions and revisiting of literature to back up the findings. The statistical methods of analysis for the present study have to be described in a clear manner (the manuscript is not sufficiently robust but can be improved).</li> </ol>	

[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>Lameck Davie Nyirenda</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Chancellor College, Malawi</b>