

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	Research Survey

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 (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 author shall provide clear methodology with the illustration of appropriate diagram and what statistical methods are used to come up with the results in Table 1 and Table 2.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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 lacks methodology explains. Please to detail out the methodology used from the starting until the end of this research.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Suggestion to add sub section for Related Works or Literature reviews to scope down on the focused area.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subsection Suggestion to be summarized under the Conclusion and Future Recommendation 2. Please to group the respondents under demographic profile so that it would be easier for analysis 3. Please to add more scientific references to support your findings 4. Please to provide details steps (Methodology) followed in this research 5. Please to specific the performance measurement conducted, eg regression analysis determines what in this result. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wan Aezwani Wan Abu Bakar
Department, University & Country	Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Malaysia