



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_25251
Title of the Manuscript:	Adoption percentage of azolla production: a post training evaluation
Type of the Article	Review paper

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) Title: It is suggested to include the name of the region where the study was conducted. 2) The Abstract does not present the main conclusions of the study. Also, repeated information appears in this section, such as: "the study was conducting During December 2015 to January 2016" (lines 6 and 11). It is suggested to rewrite the Abstract. 3) The terms used in the title should not be used as keywords. It is suggested to define new keywords. 4) In the introduction, Azolla production is presented as an alternative to animal feed for Cooch Behar district. On the other hand, in this section the variables that influence the adoption of innovations are cited. It would be desirable to incorporate a brief analysis that relates these two topics and expressing the need to perform the study. 5) Materials and Methods: more details of the methods and process should be provided in this section. How the surveys were prepared? What kind of survey conducted? What criteria the independent variables were selected? Others. 6) Improve Results and Discussion section. It is suggested to compare, contrast and discuss the results and procedures with the results of other authors. 7) Conclusions section: It is suggested to emphasize the usefulness of the information obtained in the study.	
Minor REVISION		



SDI Review Form 1.6

comments	1) Is "Azolla filiculoides" the studied species? It is suggested to add in the text the scientific name of the Azolla species. 2) The district's name is written without spaces (Coochbehar) in lines 19 and 22 and with spaces (Cooch Behar) in line 18. Check nomenclature. 3) Check citations, e.g. line 28: "Dirksen, Ament, and Go 1996" should read "Dirksen et al 1996". 4) Indicate the meaning of the acronym KVK the first time they appear in the manuscript (line 23). 5) Results section. Lines 68-71: What is the meaning of ST, SC, OBC and GEN acronyms? 6) It is suggested to incorporate some graphics instead of charts, to better visualize the results. 7) Tables 1-6 are not cited in the manuscript. 8) Some references (e.g. Abrahamson, E. 1991; Champagne, F., J-L Denis, R. Pineault, and A. Contandriopoulos 1991; others) are not cited in the manuscript. 9) Check the date of publication of Ovretveit (2002 or 2003?) 10) Add the reference "Rogers 1995" (lines 29 and 33) in the References section.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The topic studied is of great interest, however it is necessary to strongly improve the Methods section and Results and Discussion section.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Roxana Piastrellini</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universidad Tecnológica Nacional, Argentina</i>