

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_119848
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON PROFILE CHARACTERISTICS OF STAKEHOLDERS OF RYTHU BHAROSA KENDRAS (RBKs)
Type of the Article	Empirical research journal paper

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the article is essential for the scientific community. Overall, this manuscript contributes valuable empirical evidence on the characteristics of stakeholders involved in an innovative agricultural extension initiative, which can inform policymakers, extension practitioners, and researchers working towards improving farmer access to information and services. 2. The title is concise, informative, and captures the essence of the research. It indicates the subject matter and the key aspects investigated in the study. An alternative title may not be necessary, as the current title is appropriate and effectively communicates the purpose and scope of the manuscript. 3. The abstract is comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the study's background, objectives, methodology, key findings, and statistical analysis. It covers the essential elements expected in an abstract, enabling the reader to understand the study's purpose, approach, and main results. 4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well-organized. 5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound, with a well-designed methodology, rigorous data analysis, and appropriate interpretation of the findings. The study contributes to understanding stakeholder profiles in the context of the RBK initiative, which can inform future agricultural extension efforts. 6. While the references provided in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and recent, there are a few potential additional references that could be considered to strengthen the literature review further: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Recent studies on stakeholder engagement and participation in agricultural extension programs, particularly in the context of emerging technologies and digital platforms. b. Comparative analyses of agricultural extension models and their impact on farmer empowerment and access to information in India and other developing countries. c. Theoretical or conceptual frameworks related to the adoption and diffusion of agricultural innovations could provide a stronger foundation for understanding the profile characteristics of different stakeholders. d. Overall, the references in the manuscript are adequate and align with the research focus 7. Additional suggestions- Scope and Limitations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. It would be useful to include a dedicated section or paragraph in the manuscript that clearly outlines the study's scope and limitations. This will help the reader understand the boundaries and potential constraints of the research. b. For example, the manuscript could mention the geographical scope (specific states or regions), the timeframe of the data collection, any potential biases or assumptions made, and any limitations in the sampling or data collection methods. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>While there may be minor room for improvement, the manuscript's overall language and English quality are appropriate for publication in a reputable scholarly journal or academic venue. The clear and well-structured writing, appropriate use of vocabulary and terminology, and adherence to academic conventions suggest that the manuscript meets the standards expected for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured, with a clear and logical flow of ideas, and it demonstrates a strong grasp of the research topic and the relevant literature. The authors have presented their findings and conclusions in a compelling and accessible manner, making the manuscript a valuable resource for academic and practitioner audiences. Consider addressing ethical and other suggested disclosures highlighted above. See section Part 2</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Leo T. Mataruka
Department, University & Country	Catholic University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe