SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_36046**
Title of the Manuscript:	**CONSTRAINTS AND FACTORS ASSOCIATION WITH FOOD PROCESSING TRAINING AS PERCEIVED BY SC WOMEN OF HARYANA**
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:** Author to spell out any abbreviations such as "SC" in full. To include name of country. **ABSTRACT:** Author to strengthen the methodology section- for example, how many respondents were sampled? How were they selected? Was there any bias in the selection process? (Lines 8- 11) Lacks statistics- the author to quantify how many respondents had no time… (Line 12), how many respondents perceived lack of difficult technique as the main constraint? (Line 13) **INTRODUCTION:** Standard percentages- either to round or one decimal place and either use % or in write percent in words (see lines 25- 27) Write S&T in full (Line 36) The introduction in general lack adequate references, I suggest the author to add more relevant references. **METHODOLOGY**: This section needs major revision. The author must write a step by step methodology of what he/she has done so that other researchers can replicate the same study. The following questions might help in strengthening this section; (i) What was the target population size? (ii) Why were seven villages selected, why not five or eight? (iii) How was the sample size derived? Also justify this sample size (iv) How were the respondents selected? Was there no bias? Also explain how the variables in the results section such as entrepreneurial motivation, risk orientation etc were measured. The author also to justify why a Chi-square was used (line 64). Was the data normally distributed or not? **The statistical analyses (Ci-square) used seems robust.** **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:** Under all sections of the results **(**Lines 68, 87, 99, and 111), the author must interpret or explain what these results mean and also compare his/her results with other researchers' findings as this will trigger and strengthen the discussion which in the present state is weak. **CONCLUSION**: This section is brief and to the points. It is supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript and is not biased.	

	REFERENCES: The author used different referencing styles, fonts and font sizes- this must be standardized. References provided in this manuscript are also few hence a weak discussion on results.	
Minor REVISION comments	I was referring to the reference section where the author copied and pasted citations from literature. As a result, the reference list in the reviewed manuscript is in different referencing styles, fonts and font sizes. The author or Journal can standardize this section by making all references of the same font, font size and reference style.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Benjamin Mudiwa***
Department, University & Country	***University of Africa, Zambia***