



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>)



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	No. 1-2: The Title is alright. No. 6-17: An Abstract is composed of Broad objective; Brief Methodology; Major findings; Broad conclusion; and Recommendation/Policy implication. However, this is not properly written in this article. I think this stemmed from the shallowness of the paper which later suggestions will help author(s) to rewrite appropriately. No. 20-43: Author(s) should have a broad overview of the topic at hand, establishing a gap as problem statement that necessitated the study using appropriate literature in "Introduction". The objectives should be subsumed at the Later part of the "Introduction", not as independent items. No. 45-55: Author(s) should divide the Methodology into three parts: i. The Study Area – this should give the description of a place where the survey was conducted including the coordinates, etc. ii. Sampling Techniques and Data Collection – this should clearly indicate how sample was selected and also clearly show the method of collection of data; and iii. Analytical Techniques – this section involves mentioning the statistical tools used in analysing the data for ease of replication by potential authors in similar fields. No. 57-156: I have no problem with the results in tables 1-7 which are descriptive in nature, but the discussion was generally shallow and poor in grammar. Author(s) need to seek assistance of a linguist. No. 171-191: The "Summary" is not necessary. It should be replaced with "Conclusion" to be derived from the major findings of the study. No. 191: "Recommendation" or "Policy Implication(s)" should come immediately after "Conclusion", as the article is a policy paper. This will make the work richer or more relevant. No. 192-202: The volume of literature indicates the depth of consultation by author(s) on the subject matter and by extension its contribution to knowledge in the field of study. But in this paper, it's absolutely scanty. Also, two articles by Patel <i>et al.</i> (2016) appeared twice, and by all indications, they're different papers. Author(s) need to separate by using alphabets i.e. a & b. Example – Patel <i>et al.</i> (2016a) and Patel <i>et al.</i> (2016b).	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad R. Ja'afar-Furo
Department, University & Country	Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Adamawa State University, Nigeria