



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_40627
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of Students and Teachers on Achievement of RAWEP objectives
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Title of Manuscript: “Perception of Students and Teachers on Achievement of RAWEP Objectives” The title of this manuscript can be reframed to capture the study location and also the meaning of the acronym RAWEP should be included in the title. The major findings in this study are conspicuously missing in the entire abstract like the findings on perceptions of teachers and students on the achievement of RAWEP objectives and the factors influencing its performance. The introduction of this study is somehow scanty and should be strengthened to really capture the concept of RAWEP in the literature. You can have a section that is devoted to literature review around the concept of RAWEP in relation to students and teachers on how it can achieve its main objectives. Explore some empirical evidence on this study to really justify the gap this study is set to fill in the body of knowledge on this concept. The methodology of this study should include the following; brief background of the study area, sampling technique to use, analytical tools for the research among other relevant information that should feature in this section. You mentioned Chi-square as one of the analytical tools to use for this study but there was no table or any results on this in this manuscript. You can still check this to include it. The results and discussion of this study should not necessary be separated from the tables and/or figures used for this research. The major findings of this study should be presented along with the tables and not to be moved to the appendix. It is highly important to compare your own findings with the already established ones in the literature may be to uphold their findings/position vis-à-vis your own results or refute it. Moreover, It was found in this manuscript that only three references were used throughout this study, this can be worked upon by searching for other recent, relevant and highly retrievable references for this work, it will really give this study more relevance than its present state. The conclusion should be further strengthened to accommodate only the major findings in this study with no mere generalizations. Please, you can still add recommendations to your study. The recommendations must emanate from your study and should come immediately after	New title “Perception of Students and Teachers on Achievement of Rural Agricultural Work Experience Programme Objectives” As procedure number of words in the title should be limited to 8 to 10 words to make it catchy and concise, Therefore the location of the study is not mentioned and as per your suggestion I revised the title with abbreviated form of RAWEP. Abstract is revised Introduction chapter is redrafted Methodology chapter is now revised In the results and discussion chapter major findings were presented along with the tables The relevant new reviews are included in the references chapter The recommendations are included in conclusion chapter



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

	the conclusion section. Each recommendation can be presented in a paragraph and not in bullet points or numbering. The references used for this study are grossly inadequate, you can still add to it. It affects all the sections of this study. Finally, the cited authors should not be repeated too frequently and also add recent references.	
--	---	--