

Review Form 3

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

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it addresses key challenges in agricultural knowledge dissemination, particularly in rural areas. Highlighting the constraints faced by ATMA beneficiaries, it provides valuable insights into improving extension services and enhancing communication between farmers and agricultural officers. The findings are useful to shape future policy interventions to strengthen agricultural development initiatives. However, the paper would be strengthened by providing a more detailed explanation of its results.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the manuscript is suitable but a bit lengthy. An alternative title could be "Constraints and Suggestions for Agricultural Knowledge Dissemination by ATMA Beneficiaries in Chhatarpur, Madhya Pradesh."</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a solid overview, however, to enhance clarity and comprehensiveness, the following suggestions can be incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It can be more concise. Consider summarizing the key findings and implications rather than repeating results in detail. • The broader impact of the study and how these findings contribute to improving agricultural extension services could be highlighted. • A concise explanation of the data collection methods and the statistical tools used could be provided 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's subsections and structure are mostly appropriate but here are a few suggestions for more clarity and coherence.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction is well written, but it could be more concise such as the history of ATMA. • The citations are helpful, but adding more context on recent studies could improve the article. <p>Need for the Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is nicely articulated. <p>Materials and Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The methodology is good but to describe the survey instrument in little more detail would improve transparency. <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The results are well presented, but the discussion of the findings could be expanded. Rather than simply presenting the results in detail, weaving the most significant findings in the narrative form could make it more engaging. For example, why is there such a high percentage of reporting communication facilities as the primary constraint? Were there specific external factors contributing to this? • It would be useful to include more interpretation of the ranking system. <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A separate and structured conclusion section should be added summarizing the key takeaways 	

Review Form 3

	<p>and offering recommendations for future research.</p> <p>Citations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The references cited in the manuscript could be updated to include more recent literature. <p>Further Suggestions: Adding a section on limitations would enhance transparency. For example, were there any challenges in data collection?</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its methodical approach to identifying and analyzing constraints faced by ATMA beneficiaries in the Chhatarpur district. The use of a systematic ex-post-facto research design and statistical measures ensures a rigorous assessment of constraints and suggestions. The data collection from a well-defined sample and the application of IBM SPSS software for analysis further underscore the study's methodological rigor. Additionally, the manuscript's comprehensive examination of both constraints and beneficiary suggestions provides a thorough understanding of the challenges and potential solutions, reinforcing its validity and relevance to the field.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript could be updated to include more recent literature. While the context is important, it would be useful to reference any studies or reports published within the last five years to demonstrate that the study aligns with current trends or issues.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/ English quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication but could improve with some refinement. The overly complex or repetitive sentences could be avoided. Simplifying the language in certain parts will make the paper more accessible to a broader audience. As there are a few grammatical errors (e.g., "demonstration should be conduct" should be "demonstration should be conducted"), careful proofreading would improve clarity and flow.</p>	

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:	Anindita Bhattacharya
Department, University & Country	United Kingdom