



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_36915
Title of the Manuscript:	TRAINING NEEDS OF THE STATE OFFICIALS OF AGRICULTURE AND ALLIED DEPARTMENTS OF WESTERN INDIA
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This paper looks more like an internal Technical report than a research paper. There are only very few – actually 4 - references – <u>not mentioned at all in the text</u> – without any mention to foreign and international authors and Journals. If the Author(s) wish to see this work published, a major effort should be made, to frame this article into the general problem of continuing education, with reference to other cases and countries. Too simple statistical analysis, always looking at the frequency distribution, variable after variable, without any cross-tabulation. For example: do young agents have the same training needs as the old agents? What about clustering? There could be "groups" showing similar needs / opinions. Could the author try to do something more? All tables are almost ridiculous: since you have decided to have 100 respondents (decision that is not justified – statistically), tables 1-6 show that the absolute frequency (43, 32, 86...) is obviously always equal to the relative frequency (43%, 32%, 86%..). Keep eventually only the relative frequency.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The English should be improved, there are many many small mistakes.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fabio Maria Santucci
Department, University & Country	Dept. of Agricultural, University of Perugia, Italy