



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_45961
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of government institutions in adoption of Bt cotton and benefits associated with adoption
Type of the Article	Review 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	-We cannot clearly find the different part of a review: abstract, introduction, mains ideas discussed, conclusion and references. Conclusion is missing and it is not clear defined the mains ideas discussed. -Text does not enough fit with the title of the paper. Not serious in writing and not sure the author took into account recommendation to write a scientific paper -References used by authors are not the best to be used. Author has to read more then to have good scientific reference from Pakistan and abroad. Reference section is worst wrote with some reference in the text missing or some reference absent in the text reported in reference section. The author has to read the journal author guidelines to find the best way to reference.	I am sorry for my negligence I am young Scientist and I was thinking in my Article my way forward is same like conclusion but now I done with conclusion. I Respect your comments and I agree with your comments but I can not add any more scientific text in my text body because in my second paper next year all the text body is scientific with more interesting and great results but I tried my best . Its my beginning in the field of writing paper so there was some mistakes with references section now I done with all the mistakes and I hope in future I will try my best to do good job thanks for your comments and encourage .
Minor REVISION comments	-Many times, author is using many abbreviations in the text without first giving their definition. -Author can also better the design and organisation of his manuscript. -Author has to make a conclusion of his job	
Optional/General comments	-According to me, the topic of this paper is very interesting and important; that is why I accepted to review it. But it was sorry to find that the text didn't fit with the topic. Author has to give more deep scientific sense to his paper in well discussing the India situation compared to situation from many others countries which try Bt cotton cultivation and/or which are facing the same problems like Pakistan. -Author can re-design the paper organisation to find out and clearly more interesting points to be discussed. -Author has also to make his paper read by people to better it in terms of grammatical and orthographic concerns; he has to do it before any submitting for review.	I am having many things related to gene and expression level and with Monsanto technology and comparing with other countries like india ,china and Pakistan but I hope I will try to publish all other information in my research article next year because still now I am doing some experiment and waiting for results I hope you will glad to review my next paper and I will also improve my writing skills and all other mistakes that learned after your review thanks very much



PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	No there is no ethical issue.