



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_28644
Title of the Manuscript:	PERCEPTION OF DAIRY FARMERS REGARDING LIVESTOCK EXTENSION SERVICES IN DISTRICT PESHAWAR
Type of the 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:

(<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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Sources of information on dairy production only consist of Livestock and Dairy Development Dept, private livestock dairy clinic, and progressive/fellow farmers. In fact, farmers may get information also from internet, tv, newspaper, leaflet and other written materials, vcd, etc. There should be explanations about this: why only three sources are listed, while others are not in the list. Explanations about these sources of information may be related to frequency of contact with Livestock Department, frequency of officer visit, and reasons for no contact. For example, if farmers can access information from internet or tv or other media, then it can be understood if farmers did not frequently visit the Department, or Department staff did not frequently visit the farmers.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 15: diary production, should be: dairy production Line 45 and 149: diary, should be dairy Line 63-64: the last sentence can be deleted, because there is already a sentence with the same meaning in 59-60. The same thing applies to the sentence in line 74-75, 85-86, 95-96, 106-107, 116-117, 125-126, 135-136 In Tables 1-4, it is stated that 63.8% of respondents had no contact with Livestock Department. But in Table 5, all respondents (100%) were asked about their reasons for having no contact with the Department. There should be explanation about this, why all respondents, rather than only 63.8%, were asked the question. Line 112, 113: our farm should be their farm.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	H. Saediman
Department, University & Country	Dept of Agribusiness, Fac of Agriculture, Halu Oleo University, Indonesia