

## Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_124355
Title of the Manuscript:	Challenges Faced by Agri-Input Dealers in Delivering Agro Services: Constraints and Suggestions
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	Role of agri input dealers is pivotal in agro based advisory because they are in direct contact with the farmers and it is important to analyse their constraint and to know the suggesstion	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes ..one very important effort of government has not taken into consideration called DAESI program	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	No ..it is not scientifically correct...Author has done multi stage random stratified sampling ..selected 2 districts and 5 blocks and total 250 respondents...it is very unrealistic that with such an diverse sample no one was aware about DAESI program.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No ...Author needs to do more study and add refeences	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It needs some serious revesion	

### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	Aparna Jaiswal
Department, University & Country	JNKVV, India