



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_32995
Title of the Manuscript:	Constraints faced by ATMA extension functionaries of Assam and their suggestions to overcome them
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:

(<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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 2: Write the full meaning of ATMA, then use abbreviation subsequently. Line 4: Your abstract should also carry your major findings. Introduction Line 20: Your introduction should reflect: (a) Problem statement, (b) and Objective (s) of the study. Methodology State the study area, and its characteristics. Line 48: "Of "is missing (Total of 120 ATMA....) Line 48: State the total number of ATMA extension functionaries in each districts of Assam, and then tell the percentage you selected based on proportion. Line 53: Be Specific. Use descriptive statistics instead of relevant statistical measures. Line 54: Analyse the data, not interpret the data. Results and Discussion Line 58. Use table Format. *Indicate multiple response, otherwise your frequency exceed your sample size (120 ATMA) *Your table should not break. *Make your 1 into 2 or 3 tables. *indicate total frequency, if it exceed 120, put astrec to show multiple response below the table, eg *230 as your total frequency summing 80, 85 and 65 together. Below the table you indicate *Multiple Response. Line 77: Have is the appropriate word there. Line 84: KVK? Line 90: Do as you do to table 1. Line 99: Delete "in" in yearly.	We express our sincere thanks to the editor for finding the potential reviewers. Also, we are grateful to the reviewers for creative criticism and suggestions made on our manuscript. We value these suggestions and concerns raised and accordingly revised the manuscript. All the changes made in this manuscript have been highlighted throughout the text. Hope this revised manuscript would now meet the criteria of your esteemed journal. Line 2: The correction is done in the paper. Line 4: The suggestion is accepted and written accordingly Line 20: The instruction is followed accordingly. Methodology portion is added with the study area and its characteristics. Line 48: The correction is done. Line 48: The correction is done. Line 53: The correction is done. Line 54: The correction is done. Line 58: It is done as suggested. Line 77: The correction is done. Line 84: Extremely sorry. The correction is done. Line 90: It is done as suggested. Line 99: The correction is done. It is given already in a simple and understandable way.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Try to present your result in a very simple and understandable way.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Conclusion Consider revising and make overall conclusion based upon your findings and objectives	It is already written based on findings and objective of the study.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Review other publications to make your writing, tone and structure fit in with the overall styles of scientific literature particularly in result discussion. Consider reviewing manuscript grammar.	