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)

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	**Abstract** In my opinion the abstract should be reduced to convey essential information about the four main parts of the paper (introduction, methods, results, conclusions). Many academic journals' web sites offer guidelines on abstract writing; here you are an example: http://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/authors/guides/write/abstracts.htm?part=1#2. Try and avoid the use of acronyms in the abstract. **Introduction** This paragraph should clearly state the problem your research is addressing, why your research makes a difference with respect to similar existing studies, how you aim at addressing the problem and why. You should briefly present the case study and say why you selected it and why it may help to address your problem. Research objectives have to be clearly presented.More or less, your paper has all of the above elements; however, the text misses reference to relevant policy in India (e.g. for boosting agricultural studies) and to recent academic papers. So, the rationale behind your research turns to be weak. In addition, I would suggest mentioning business strategies of big agricultural and/or food enterprises in India, including those in the bioeconomy sector. **Background studies** I think you should introduce the literature review. Something like "to date, researchers had address the issue of … by means of …. Concerning developing countries …. With respect to India, however …" Lines 77-79 are more suitable for the introduction **Methodology** The introductory paragraph (lines 81-93) are, in fact, the description of the case study. In my opinion, you should dedicate a separate paragraph to the case study, to be placed after the "material and methods" paragraph.The subparagraph "sampling of respondents" should besomewhat merged with the case study paragraph. In the "data collection" paragraph you may describe the sample. With this respect, I would maybe avoid the use of the word sample, because you did not sample your respondents, did you? You may explain the way how you administered the questionnaire; e.g., interview with the head	• I have modified the abstract based on the suggestions. And i have also explained the acronyms. • Research objectives has been clearly presented. • reference to relevant policy in India is added. • Lines 77-79 were moved to introduction • Literature review pertaining to current date and relevant study areas were included. • The introductory paragraph in materials and methods is renamed as study area. • Yes I have sampled the respondents. Each department consists of approximately 10 to 15 staff members among which I have chosen only two respondents correspondingly from senior and junior scientists criteria and specifically handling courses for undergraduate students. This I have mentioned in my methodology part. • questionnaire was administered – already mentioned • Modified: Kerlinger was cited within brackets • Questionnaire parts has been included • Modified: There are some typos (e.g. line 136 and following lines display excess zeros). • Modified: Line 146 ("one fourth of …): 25% in brackets is redundant • Subparagraph 4.3 is substantiated with existing literature. And as the suggestions were highly situation oriented the exact needs of the teaching staff were addressed • Conclusion: updated

	of the bachelor programme, and so on and so forth. You may say something like "the questionnaire was administered to lectures, professors, researchers, and so on ... employed in the department of …, teaching undergraduate classes of… Lines 117-124 should be reduced to a sentence, saying about your research approach; you can then cite Kerlinger in brackets. What's the theoretical framework of your research? You should provide details about questionnaire design, i.e. what are questionnaire sections? What are the questions? Displaying the whole questionnaire is not necessary; maybe, you can provide a synthesis table or a picture of a filled-in questionnaire form. **Results** There are some typos (e.g. line 136 and following lines display excess zeros). Line 146 ("one fourth of …): 25% in brackets is redundant Subparagraph 4.3: this is the core of the article; you need to substantiate everything with existing literature; e.g., "we suggest this approach because it worked in similar conditions in (XXXX et al., 201X)" **Conclusions** Can you say a bit more about the policy implications of your study? Do you have any suggestions for prospective researchers?	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		