

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_85354
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact Assessment of Front Line Demonstration (FLDs) on Yield of Green gram
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Table 2- must include proper units of extension gap and technology index.</li><li>- Table 2- the MEAN values for % increase, gap and index should be calculated individually. They should not be averaged.</li><li>- Table 3- mean B:C ratio needs to be calculated separately. It cannot be averaged.</li><li>- The Conclusion has to be written pointing towards exact impact of CFLDs on yield, in smaller sentences. The Conclusion has only two (2) sentences. The second sentence must be broken down into pieces to convey the exact message.</li><li>- In References, a uniform pattern of writing needs to be followed. Few references diverge from the common pattern.</li><li>- Jeengar et al (2006); Kumar et al (2019) and Sangeetha et al (2020) are not cited anywhere in the article. Thus, should be deleted from the References.</li></ul>	<b>As per suggestion and essential part in current research paper is corrected and submitted for publication</b>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Language of can be improved with respect to English grammar.</li><li>- Demo should be properly written as 'Demonstration' in formal language.</li><li>- Smaller sentences with fewer words should be written. Longer sentences may be avoided.</li><li>- Conclusion should be written properly.</li></ul>	<b>As per suggestion and essential part in current research paper is corrected and submitted for publication</b>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Sentences in the beginning of Introduction do not follow a sequence, which can be improvised.</li><li>- Results should point towards possible cause and effect relationships, pointing exact correlation.</li></ul>	<b>As per suggestion and essential part in current research paper is corrected and submitted for publication</b>

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> <b>No</b>	<b>As per suggestion and essential part in current research paper is corrected and submitted for publication</b>