

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_87466
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio- economic profile of the farmers in five agro-climatic zones of Punjab
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The <b>Title</b> has to be slightly modified.</li><li>2. The <b>Abstract</b> has some language and technical errors. They need to be rectified.</li><li>3. The <b>Introduction</b> although very brief and mentions the problem of the study but lacks Literature Review. The Literature Review has to be incorporated.</li><li>4. The <b>Materials and Methods</b> has been very poorly presented. It should have been written under different sub-heads namely, Study Area with Location Map of the <b>Zones (which have not been mentioned in the running text)</b>, Experimental Design, Data Collection and Data Analysis. This portion requires to be re-written.</li><li>5. The <b>Results and Discussion</b> have numerous errors which have been highlighted in the Reviewer's Manuscript. The Author should study the comments and make necessary amendments. The Author has used ANOVA and other basic statistics to reveal the significance of data. It is observed, that nothing much is discussed on the significance of the data except that which is revealed in the Tables. It is not clear which parameters were compared to visualize the significance of data. Moreover, there are 5 Zones which have been studied. There is no clue to the Zones in the Materials and Methods.</li><li>6. The <b>References</b> presented seem to show the Vancouver Method but the Author has followed the Harvard method. The Author has to draw his attention to the format of the Journal.</li></ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Nil	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Even though, the topic of the study seems interesting, but the manner of its presentation does not qualify to be accepted. A thorough Major Revision is suggested.	

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sudip Barat
Department, University & Country	University of North Bengal, India