



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_40047
Title of the Manuscript:	Constraints Perceived by the Agricultural Scientists in Teaching Undergraduate Students: An Analysis in TNAU
Type of the Article	Original research 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>)



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	Manuscript Title: "Constraints Perceived by the Agricultural Scientists in Teaching Undergraduate Students: An Analysis in TNAU" ✓ This study on constraints perceived by Agricultural scientists in teaching undergraduate students in Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India addressed critically the challenges faced by the university teachers in achieving effective teaching and learning environment. ✓ The title can be reframed as "Constraints Perceived by the Agricultural Scientists in Teaching Undergraduate Students in Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India". ✓ The abstract captured the main purpose of this study but the way the human percent reported for male and female with decimal points are not scientifically acceptable. Instead of 51.9percent male and 41.1percent female should be 52percent male and 41percent female. Also, percent lower than 10 should be reported in words first and the figure should be in bracket like "nine (9)percent" ✓ The study gave some literature search on the state of agriculture in India in the introduction; you should endeavour to cite those authorities behind those statements. ✓ The research is mainly a descriptive study. From your findings, you can still compare your results	• The title suggestion was found to be suitable as it is more clear and specific about the study area and objective. • The percentage revision was made to reduce the ambiguity of readers. • Literatures related to state of agricultural education in India was included in the introduction. • The results of the previous studies were included in the discussion part for comparison of current scenario • More reference were included • The recommendations and conclusion part has been updated



SDI Review Form 1.6

	with other previous literature either to affirm or refute their findings based on your own research results. The results and discussion are well articulated and with much clarity. ✓ The study recommendations are conspicuously missing. You should add the study recommendations emanating from your research and not mere generalization. ✓ The study can still consult more recent, relevant and retrievable references to really increase the credibility of this research outputs in relation to already established body of knowledge. Always adhering to the journal's guideline for writing references.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	All minor corrections are already included in the corrected version of the main manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Nil	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>