

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_124112
Title of the Manuscript:	Challenges in Accessing Agricultural Technology Information Centre's Services: Identifying Key Constraints in Kanpur District
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript 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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Strengths of the Paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study discusses an important issue, especially in light of India's agricultural development. In order to guarantee that farmers have access to the latest information and technology, Agricultural Technology Information Centers (ATICs) must overcome significant challenges. 2. A solid foundation of empirical data is provided to support the study's conclusions by the use of a descriptive survey method and the inclusion of a sizable sample size (300 farmers) from the Kanpur area. 3. The work is easy to read and has a clear structure with different sections for the introduction, methodology, results, discussions, and conclusions. 4. The report provides readers with a thorough picture of the challenges that farmers encounter in getting ATIC services by identifying specific constraints that are administrative, infrastructural, and extension-related. <p>Weakness of the Paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A more thorough review of the literature would be beneficial to the work in order to provide contextual information and address previous studies on ATICs and their efficacy. Citing additional sources would improve the paper's basis, especially those that address related topics in different areas. 2. Although the research discusses administrative and infrastructure issues, a more thorough examination of socioeconomic factors (such as income inequality and educational barriers) that impact farmers' access to ATICs will add more depth to the subject. 3. The recommendations made are feasible, however they might be strengthened with more thorough implementation strategies. Suggestions such as "full-time staff" and "adequate budget" could include advice on how these resources could be managed or distributed effectively. 4. The paper makes use of statistical methods such as mean scores; nevertheless, by providing an explanation of the meaning of these values, it may become clearer. An explanation of the ranking system's development and the severity of the threshold scores, for example, would help to clarify how the data should be interpreted. 5. Although the tables are helpful, readers would find the results more readable and visually appealing if they were presented in the form of charts or graphs (e.g., bar charts comparing the mean values of different constraints). <p>Additional Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The language might be improved in a few places to make it precise and clear. Moreover, make sure that the formatting is consistent throughout the work, particularly when tables and figures are used to display the results. <p>Recommendations for further study could be included in the paper's conclusion. One way to contribute a forward-looking perspective would be to suggest longitudinal research to evaluate how policy or infrastructure changes affect farmers' access to ATICs over time.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Roopal Gangwar
Department, University & Country	University of Agriculture & Technology, India