



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_34517
Title of the Manuscript:	A Qualitative Study Examining Core Competency Needs of Agricultural Extension Professionals in Nepal
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 <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		
Minor REVISION comments	Line 53-54 "Most core-competency-related studies in agricultural extension and 54 education are from the West, particularly the United States" The author had cited these studies in Line 69-83. In my view these lines should be in introduction section. I am not sure how identifying studies abroad can be constituted as an objective of a study (Objective 1) Line 106-148 should be in Introduction Section Line 95 – Focus group interviews were carried out. Is there any interview protocol which was followed in each interviews? Line 366 – Language error Today's is the era of ICTs and disseminating 367 information using ICTs is quick, less costly and easy to reach out to a large number of users	We greatly appreciated your comments. We have reordered manuscript accordingly. Yes, as mentioned in method section the pre-approved discussion guide/interview protocol was used for FGDs. We have corrected the sentences.
Optional/General comments	Line 468-475 – Could be extended/moved to another section. In my view, it would be helpful and more contributing if a section on Policy Recommendations is written. Line 468-475 could be moved to this section (Policy Recommendation) and elaborated more.	The sentences are reorganized.