

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_123105
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on Content Analysis of a Farm Magazine Published by a Veterinary University, Ludhiana.
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.	The manuscript presents a valuable quantitative analysis of the contents published in the Vigyanak Pashu Palan magazine. This study is particularly important for the scientific community as it highlights trends in the dissemination of veterinary and agricultural information in rural India, providing insights into the information needs of livestock farmers. The manuscript is scientifically robust, and the methodologies used are sound, contributing valuable data to the field of agricultural extension.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and clearly summarizes the key findings of the study. However, it could be enhanced by briefly mentioning the significance of these findings in the broader context of agricultural extension. Additionally, the abstract should briefly mention the methodological limitations.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure are appropriate and logical, facilitating a clear understanding of the study.	
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.	While the manuscript is scientifically sound, employing well-established content analysis techniques, the interpretation of the results lacks depth. The authors should explore the reasons behind the observed trends in more detail, perhaps by incorporating qualitative insights or by referencing related studies more critically. Furthermore, the statistical analysis, although correct, could be expanded to include a discussion of the confidence intervals or other measures of variability that would strengthen the conclusions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate but not entirely up to date. The manuscript could benefit from incorporating more recent studies, particularly those published in the last 3-5 years, to ensure that it reflects the latest advancements in the field.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear but could be improved. There are several instances where the phrasing is difficult or the grammar is incorrect. A thorough proofreading is recommended to enhance readability and ensure that the manuscript meets scholarly communication standards.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript addresses an important topic, but its impact is currently limited by the lack of critical analysis and engagement with existing literature. The authors should also consider discussing the practical implications of their findings more explicitly, such as how the magazine could be improved to better serve its readership.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with the 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?	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adrian Nagy
Department, University & Country	Institute of Applied Economics, University of Debrecen, Hungary