

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
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

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.	As input dealers act as the most accessible and credible sources of information, identifying the constraints faced by them can lead to more efficient delivery of these services, improving the overall productivity of farming. Understanding the difficulties faced by input dealers can inform government and private sectors in designing better support mechanisms for input dealers. Policies addressing reimbursement delays or challenges in demonstrating field results could lead to more effective extension programs and more engaged input dealers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is appropriate.	
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 was brief and comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Introduction has to be modified. The methodology part (stratified random sampling) can be explained through a schematic diagram.	
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.	Titles of the tables has to be changed as "Ranking of constraints" instead of distribution of resopondents. The results have to be written in past tense.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Few more references can be added from the recent last five years	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language has to be improved further to suits for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Tadepalli Yamini
Department, University & Country	Acharya N. G. Ranga Agricultural University, India