

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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the content and readability of farm magazines, which are crucial tools for disseminating agricultural knowledge to farmers.</p> <p>By analyzing the focus, format, and readability of articles in a farm magazine published by a veterinary university, the study highlights the effectiveness of such publications in conveying information to a target audience with varying literacy levels.</p> <p>I appreciate the manuscript for its practical implications. It sheds light on how agricultural communication can be optimized to serve farmers' needs better, ultimately contributing to more effective knowledge transfer in the agricultural sector. However, to enhance its impact, the manuscript could benefit from a more thorough discussion of its findings and a clear conclusion.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is not well-formulated</p> <p>"A Study on Content Analysis of a Farm Magazine Published by a Veterinary University, Ludhiana."</p> <p>Suggested title "Content Analysis of a Farm Magazine Published by a Veterinary University in Ludhiana: A Case Study"</p>	
<p>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>	<p>The number of issues in the abstract (105) differs from the one in the methods (108).</p> <p>Suggested Additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly state the study's primary objective or research question at the beginning of the abstract. Mention any statistically significant findings briefly, if available. Briefly mention the practical implications of the findings or how this analysis contributes to the broader understanding of farm magazine content. <p>Suggested Deletions or Revisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid redundancy such as "The study revealed that the mean number of articles per issue stood at 11.65 ± 1.98, occupying an average space of 25.93 ± 5.04 pages (72.03%)." rather simplify or remove repetitive numerical details that can be discussed in the main text. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It can be revised as "On average, each issue contained 11.65 articles covering 72.03% of the magazine's space." Simplify technical details such as "Articles typically comprised of 8.29 ± 4.20 paragraphs, 127.77 ± 65.18 lines, 49.37 ± 24.10 sentences, and 890.27 ± 687.22 words, with an average of 2.66 ± 1.56 technical words in each article." Rather condense detailed statistics into a more general statement to improve readability. For example "Articles varied in length, with an average of 8 paragraphs and 890 words, often including technical terminology." 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sections are appropriate, though the conclusion and recommendation are missing in some areas. The manuscript is well-structured but would benefit from minor reorganization to enhance clarity and coherence. Consider adding more specific section headers (e.g., "Content Analysis of Articles," "Readability Assessment") to guide the reader through the manuscript. A conclusion section is recommended to summarize the study's findings and implications effectively. 	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. The study employs a rigorous quantitative content analysis method, which is appropriate for the research objective of evaluating the magazine's content across different periods. Also, selecting a significant number of issues (105) covering various years ensures that the findings represent the magazine's evolution. Using statistical tools like SPSS to analyze data and application of the Coleman-Liau Index for readability analysis add to the methodological rigour, enhancing the reliability and validity of the results. The manuscript also provides detailed classifications and evaluations based on various parameters, such as subject matter, format, authorship, and species coverage, which offer a nuanced understanding of the magazine's content.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear relevant to the topic, but there might be room for improvement in terms of sufficiency and recency. Depending on the depth and scope of the literature review, the researcher might want to consider adding more recent studies, particularly those published in the last five years, to ensure that the manuscript is grounded in the most up-to-date research.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there may be areas where minor improvements could enhance clarity and readability. The manuscript effectively conveys its ideas, but attention to grammatical accuracy, sentence structure, and word choice could further refine the text. Additionally, ensuring that the language is precise and free of jargon will make the article more accessible to a broader audience. Overall, while the language is adequate for scholarly purposes, a careful review and possible editing could elevate the quality.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Hillary Busolo</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Alupe University, Kenya</p>