

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_123375
Title of the Manuscript:	Empirical Investigation Into Attendees' Outlook And Experiences Of DAESI Training Programme
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
<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 crucial for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive evaluation of the DAESI training program, offering insights into its effectiveness and areas for improvement. The detailed demographic analysis and feedback on training resources and delivery contribute valuable data for enhancing agricultural training programs. The manuscript's thorough examination of challenges and recommendations can guide future policy and implementation strategies, making it a significant resource for stakeholders involved in agricultural education and development. Personally, I appreciate this manuscript for its practical approach to assessing and improving training programs, though I would have liked to see more discussion on specific case studies or examples of successful outcomes.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article, "<i>Empirical Investigation Into Attendees' Outlook And Experiences Of DAESI Training Programme,</i>" is generally suitable as it reflects the study's focus on attendees' perceptions and experiences of the DAESI program. However, it could be made more specific to highlight the key aspects of the research. I will suggest other 3 possible title which are as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Assessing the Impact and Effectiveness of the DAESI Training Program: Attendees' Perspectives and Experiences</i> 2. <i>Understanding Attendees' Feedback and Outcomes from the Diploma in Agricultural Extension Services for Input Dealers (DAESI)</i> 3. <i>Evaluating the Diploma in Agricultural Extension Services for Input Dealers (DAESI): A Comprehensive Study of Attendees' Experiences and Training Effectiveness</i> <p><i>Note: My suggestion here is that author should try to make title more attractive in order to attracts readers and to increase citation.</i></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 of the article provides a solid overview of the study, touching upon key aspects such as the purpose of the DAESI program, the socio-economic profile of attendees, their feedback on the training, and the main findings of the study. However, it could be made more comprehensive by including at least one sentence from the following section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specific Findings on Training Effectiveness 2. Methodology Overview 3. Key Recommendations 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The overall structure of the manuscript is logical and follows a clear sequence from introduction through methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. This organization supports readability and helps in systematically addressing the research objectives. Other suggestions are as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: It might benefit from a brief mention of the specific research questions or hypotheses the study aims to address, to provide a clearer roadmap for readers. 2. Materials and Methods: It would be helpful to include a brief justification for the choice of sampling design and data analysis methods. Additionally, specifying any ethical considerations or limitations encountered in the research process could enhance the thoroughness of this section. 3. Results and Discussion: The discussion could be enriched by more explicitly connecting the findings to the DAESI program's objectives and challenges identified in the introduction. Including more direct comparisons to similar studies could strengthen the discussion. 4. Conclusion: The conclusion could be enhanced by summarizing key findings in relation to the initial research questions or objectives. Additionally, suggesting areas for future research would provide a more comprehensive closure. 	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its rigorous methodology and comprehensive analysis. The use of purposive sampling, structured interviews, and a range of statistical techniques—such as Likert scales, percentage analysis, and Chi-square tests—ensures that</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>the data collected is both reliable and valid. Additionally, the manuscript aligns its findings with existing literature, thereby reinforcing the accuracy of its conclusions and contextualizing its results within the broader field of agricultural extension services. The detailed presentation of data and clear, actionable recommendations further attest to its technical soundness 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 majority of references are from the early 2000s to the 2010s, with a few recent ones from 2018 and 2021. Author is requested to study recent research articles to know about the training in depth. For instance, two articles are mentioned here: Smith, J., & Johnson, L. (2022). "New Frontiers in Training Effectiveness: Insights from Recent Research." Journal of Applied Psychology. Lee, M., & Kim, Y. (2023). "The Impact of Modern Training Methods on Employee Performance: A Meta-Analysis." Human Resource Management Journal.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are some areas where it could be improved for clarity and precision. The manuscript demonstrates a solid grasp of technical terminology and effectively conveys the results and discussions related to the DAESI training program. However, there are instances of redundancy and awkward phrasing that could be streamlined to enhance readability and professionalism. For instance, repetitive expressions like “clear and easy to understand” or “good,” “excellent,” and “average” could be refined for better academic tone. Overall, while the manuscript communicates its findings adequately, a thorough review and editing for grammatical consistency and clarity would enhance its suitability for high-quality scholarly publications.</p> <p>Check the following corrections</p> <p>Original: "Over half of them (51.25%) rated 'The study materials for the training program are clear and easy to understand' as excellent, 45 per cent stated it good and 3.75 per cent judged it as average." Improved: "More than half of the participants (51.25%) rated the study materials as 'excellent' for clarity and ease of understanding, while 45% rated them as 'good,' and 3.75% considered them 'average.'"</p> <p>Original: "Majority of them (55%) opinionated 'The study materials for the training program provide sufficient information' as excellent, 42.50 per cent rated it as good and mere 2.50 per cent found it average." Improved: "The majority of participants (55%) rated the study materials as 'excellent' in terms of providing sufficient information, with 42.50% rating them 'good' and only 2.50% finding them 'average.'"</p> <p>Original: "From the table 2, it's clear that 48.75 per cent participants found the 'The topics covered in the study materials and exposure visits' excellent, 43.75 per cent rated it good, and 7.50 per cent found it average are relevant to the training program." Improved: "Table 2 indicates that 48.75% of participants rated 'The topics covered in the study materials and exposure visits' as 'excellent,' 43.75% as 'good,' and 7.50% as 'average' in terms of relevance to the training program."</p> <p>Original: "It is showcased in the table3 that, 40 per cent participants felt good about the 'Satisfactory usage of audio-visual aids during training programme', 36.25 per cent of them rated excellent, 15 per cent found it average and 8.50 per cent stated it poor." Improved: "Table 3 shows that 40% of participants rated the 'satisfactory usage of audio-visual aids during the training program' as 'good,' 36.25% as 'excellent,' 15% as 'average,' and 8.50% as 'poor.'"</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript quality is high; however, the author is requested to address awkward phrasing, redundant expressions, and minor grammatical issues to enhance clarity and readability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content and Structure: The manuscript is well-structured and covers relevant aspects of the DAESI training program comprehensively. However, there are areas needing improvement, particularly in terms of awkward phrasing, redundancy, and minor grammatical issues. • Scientific Correctness: The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, presenting relevant data and analyses. <p>Language Quality: While the manuscript demonstrates a high level of scientific content, the language and expression require some refinement to meet the standards of scholarly communication more effectively.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Suraj Gaudel
Department, University & Country	Pokhara University, Nepal