

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAEES_116704</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A SCALE TO MEASURE THE PERCEPTION OF GRADUATES TOWARDS STUDENT READY PROGRAMME</b>
Type of the Article	<b>research article</b>

**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><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides a detailed evaluation of the Student Rural Entrepreneurship Awareness Development Yojana (READY) programme. It contributes to the understanding of how experiential learning and entrepreneurship education can be integrated into agricultural studies, which is crucial for developing countries where agriculture plays a significant role in the economy.</p> <p>The title is ok, however, a more suitable title for such a manuscript could be "Evaluating the Impact of the READY Programme on Agricultural Entrepreneurship Education". If the current title does not reflect the content and findings of the research, it may need to be revised to better represent the study's focus and outcomes.</p> <p>The abstract provides a comprehensive job of summarizing the research process and findings. It outlines the development and validation of a scale to measure graduates' perceptions of the Student READY Programme (SRP). The abstract details the methodological steps taken, from the initial literature review and expert discussions to the relevancy rating by ICAR and SAU scientists and extension specialists. It also explains the criteria for statement selection and the item analysis process that led to the final scale. Moreover, the abstract reports the statistical measures of reliability ('r' value of 0.922) and indicates the scale's high reliability and validity. It concludes with the potential application of the scale for future research. This level of detail is appropriate for an abstract, as it gives readers a clear overview of the study's purpose, methodology, results, and implications without delving into the specifics that are typically reserved for the full article. Therefore, it can be considered comprehensive.</p> <p>The manuscript's structure, with an introduction, methodology, results, and conclusion sections, is appropriate for a research article. The detailed item analysis and the development of the perception scale suggest a well-organized approach. The inclusion of tables and the use of statistical measures for reliability and validity add to the manuscript's rigor.</p> <p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It follows a logical research methodology, employs recognized statistical techniques, and presents its findings systematically.</p> <p>The references listed are classical texts in the field of psychometrics and scale construction, which provide foundational knowledge for the development of perception scales. However, they are quite dated. In the rapidly evolving field of agricultural education and perception measurement, more recent studies and methodologies could provide updated insights and reflect current practices.</p> <p><b>Some additional suggestions and comments regarding the manuscript:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Literature Review:</b> It would be beneficial to include a more comprehensive literature review</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>section that situates the READY program within the current context of agricultural education and entrepreneurship. This could involve comparing the READY program's approach to other similar programmes around the world and discussing the unique contributions of this study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Methodological Rigor:</b> While the methodology seems robust, providing more details about the selection process of the experts who evaluated the statements could enhance the manuscript's rigor. Information about the experts' qualifications and their relevance to the field of agricultural education would add credibility to the relevancy rating process.</li> <li>• <b>Statistical Analysis:</b> The manuscript could benefit from a more detailed explanation of the statistical methods used in the item analysis. This would help readers understand the process and the justification for the selection of the final statements.</li> <li>• <b>Discussion Section:</b> A discussion section that interprets the findings in relation to the existing body of knowledge would be valuable. This could include potential implications for policy and practice, as well as suggestions for how the READY program might be improved based on the graduates' perceptions.</li> <li>• <b>Limitations and Future Research:</b> Acknowledging the limitations of the study and suggesting areas for future research can provide a balanced view and encourage further investigation into the READY programme's effectiveness.</li> <li>• <b>Practical Implications:</b> The manuscript could discuss the practical implications of the findings for educators, policymakers, and program designers. How can the perception scale be used to inform the development and refinement of similar programmes?</li> <li>• <b>Graphical Representations:</b> Including graphical representations of the data, such as bar charts or scatter plots, could make the results more accessible and engaging for readers who may not be as familiar with statistical tables.</li> <li>• <b>Accessibility:</b> Consider the accessibility of the manuscript for an international audience. Providing a clear explanation of the READY program and its context within the Indian agricultural education system would be helpful for readers who are not familiar with it.</li> </ul> <p><b>These suggestions aim to enhance the manuscript's clarity, depth, and impact within the scientific community and beyond. The study presents valuable insights into the READY programme, and these additional considerations could further strengthen its contribution to the field.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality appears to be generally suitable for scholarly communication. The text uses formal academic language and seems to follow a logical structure. The terminology is appropriate for the subject matter, and the sentences are coherent and purposeful.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript presents a valuable study on the perception of graduates towards the Student READY Programme (SRP). The research appears to be methodologically sound and contributes to the field of agricultural education and entrepreneurship. Here are some general comments and suggestions:</p>	

**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>Ali Hashemi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Yazd University, Iran</b>