

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_123127
Title of the Manuscript:	Constraints encountered by the KVK beneficiaries of Manipur and their suggestions
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it advances our understanding of the constraints encountered by the beneficiaries of KVKs. Through the application of rigorous methodologies accompanied with a robust data, it gives new perceptions that could enlighten and notify future research and governmental departments. The study's in-depth scrutiny and rich demonstration of the outcomes add to the body of knowledge, possibly leading successive inquiries and prompting policy in applicable spaces.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Challenges faced by KVK beneficiaries in Manipur and their recommendations. 2. Challenges and Recommendations from KVK Beneficiaries in Manipur. 	
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.	<p>The main purpose of KVK is to impart learning by 'work experience' and they tailor the training and programs according to the needs of the farmers of the specific region. They organize trainings for the capacity development of the farmers by methods of 'teaching by doing' and 'learning by doing'. North East India consists of eight states, viz; Meghalaya, Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Sikkim, Nagaland, Tripura, Mizoram and Manipur. (No need to list all of them here, "Consist of eight states" is enough under abstract) Agriculture serves as the predominant occupation within the region, supporting more than 80 per cent (percent) of the population either directly or indirectly. The study reveals that unawareness of govt. subsidy programmes (62.5%), seeds of recent varieties are not available at KVK (45%) and recent release varieties are not included in frontline demonstration (39.2%). Constraints like the terms/concepts used in training programmes are scientific and hence difficult to understand (7.5%), less emphasis on practical (Skill training) (5.8%) and KVK staff/scientists are untrained/inexperienced (0%) (This cannot be a challenge but a positive outcome) were the least encountered constraints by the respondents. It is also suggested that more information should be provided on available govt. subsidy programmes (68.3% and 88.3%), (.) KVK should arrange more (a greater) number of training programmes on allied activities (,) i.e. poultry, goatry (Goat farming), and food processing (53.3% and 68.3%), Newly released varieties should be included in FLD (55% and 63.3%) and Inputs should be provided by KVK itself (46.7% and 51.7%).</p> <p>Keyword: Constraint, KVK, Beneficiary, Farmer, Suggestion and Manipur</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are appropriate	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and sound because it demonstrates rigorous methodology which provided a clear path the results attained, it consists of a rich and coherent structure, effective data analysis, and fairly interpretation of the outcomes. It should include a well-defined research question is well defined and comprehensive literature review although most part of it is five years older and only references which is five years old, such reduces the richness of the paper.	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	One reference is 5 years old (2019) and the rest are way older	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is okay however proofreading will be necessary	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Tshikororo Mashudu
Department, University & Country	University of Venda, South Africa