

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_89583
Title of the Manuscript:	A Path Analytic Study of Profile Characteristics on Attitude and Career Preferences of Polytechnic students
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>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>First of all i must do appreciate the researcher effort undertaken in an area of research. I am really sorry to state that my comments could be hurting for the authours if not taken positively. I am sure the journal is maintaing higher standards of research quality and integrity and therefore communicate these comments to authors as a source of guidance for improvement of this manuscript; off couse when published it will give them repute (good or bad) and i am sure none of the journals would be accepting this manuscript as it is, now.</p> <p>I have marked my detailed comments in the manuscript and the same should be shared with the authors for their guidance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whole paper proceeded in an understandable sequence. But paragraphs have no logical start and end nor are they rationally related to each other. 2. Strong theoretical base for this study is missing. 3. Exiting gap / problem statement has not been effectively identified. 4. Recent significant literature has been ignored when writing introduction, literature, and analysis of this study. 5. There is unnecessary pros hiding what the authors intended to state. 6. Research objective has not been clearly stated. 7. Hypotheses are not clearly stated and aligned with proposed model of study. 8. Many statements / claims made are not supported with references. 9. Selected variables have not been operationally defined and introduced to the readers of paper. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Method and findings of pilot study are not properly elaborated. 2. Research design (correlational, or causal, or both) is not clearly stated. 3. Sampling protocol is not described. Sample size is not representative of selected infinite population. 4. Data collection strategy is not mentioned; how participants were selected, approached, and a better response rate was ensured? 5. It is not clearly stated as to which tools were used for analysis i.e. SPSS, AMOS, Minitab. 6. Results are not properly interpreted / discussed with support / critic of relevant literature. Analysis portion is just recitation of tabulated results. 7. Results, discussion, conclusion, and recommendations seem contradictory in statements. 	
Optional/General comments	I thank the researcher for this good effort and advise him to use the simple English language in his academic writing.	

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:	Ahmad Ali Abdel Sater
Department, University & Country	Now Valley University, Egypt