

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARJA_123149</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>CONSTRAINTS ENCOUNTERED AND SUGGESTIONS OFFERED BY ATMA BENEFICIARY FOR DISSEMINATING AGRICULTURAL KNOWLEDGE IN CHHATARPUR DISTRICT OF MADHYA PRADESH</b>
Type of the Article	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	The manuscript is very essential for the study area and others to introduce and enhance the dissemination of agricultural information timely. The timely information benefits the producers and beneficiaries or customers to exchange those agricultural commodities. It is crucial topic to alleviate the information barriers among the producers or beneficiaries.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is suitable but it should be modified like "CONSTRAINTS ENCOUNTERED BY ATMA BENEFICIARIES FOR DISSEMINATING AGRICULTURAL KNOWLEDGE IN CHHATARPUR DISTRICT OF MADHYA PRADESH, INDIA"	
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 is not comprehensive. a. The abstract lacks the objective of the study which is the core point of the research. b. It also lacks the research methodology, sampling techniques, research types, data collection tools... c. Not included conclusion and recommendation. The results are more explained in the abstract, so it should be minimized. It is enough to explain one leading or two results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript missed the conclusion and recommendation.	
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.	The manuscript followed the scientific research steps. The topic also relevant for the agricultural beneficiaries to improve the yield and to sell their products timely. This may contribute a lot for the agricultural sector individuals and the country at large. It may produce possible solution for those identified constraints.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not sufficient	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Somehow, it is good.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript should use the inferential statistics. To generalize the result for the population inferential statistics or other econometric models are crucial. In a quantitative research, it is impossible to generalize without inferential statistics. It seems like a report because it describes the statistics only.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Alemzewud, Melsew Mihretie</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ethiopia</b>