

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_116526
Title of the Manuscript:	Training Impact Assessment: Evaluating PAMETI's Programs for Punjab's Extension Personnel
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 '**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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Yes. Training is often a neglected area yet it is a the most common approach used by extension workers. It would have been good to include aspects of gender.</p> <p>The title is suitable, though the article does not dwell on impact. Impact is measured at the level of trainees and recipients of extension services. This is not at all addressed by the article. The article focuses on evaluation of the training and focuses on trainees/extension workers who were trained.</p> <p>The abstract is similarly shallow. It should also be written following the structure of the paper.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct but lacked proper grounding in literature to clearly bring out the research problem.</p> <p>A deep and thorough literature search would have yielded more relevant articles.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author should read about how to conduct a training impact assessment. Am sure there should be a lot even via google.</p> <p>The recommendation are equally shallow ad not pointing to specific responsible entities.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gertrude Atukunda
Department, University & Country	Uganda