

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_126369
Title of the Manuscript:	Analyzing Knowledge Gain in Women Farmers: Insights from Tuber Crop Cultivation Training
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I do not like very much this manuscript, because I consider that the methods section is poorly developed, because they do not include the format that was applied to the women to know the questions, with respect to the statistical techniques that were used, these are not well described. SEE ATTACHMENT	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I consider that the methods section is poorly developed	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I think that the work has a social application character, rather than a scientific one. There is no experimental development that supports this manuscript	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No problem	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	Take into account the comments and suggestions that are included in the document There are not competing interest issues in this manuscript There are not ethical issues in this manuscript	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jose Luis Gomez Marquez
Department, University & Country	FES Zaragoza, National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), Mexico