

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAEES_88698</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A case study on demographic attributes of the agriculture postgraduate students of Uttar Pradesh</b>
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:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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	<p><b>In my own view, this study was prepared in a hurry why jettisoning most of the salient aspects of this study.</b></p> <p><b>Starting with the abstract, brief results, discussion, and conclusion are conspicuously missing. Add a recommendation emanating from the findings of this study at the tail end of the abstract. In the introduction, it is important that author(s) present a more robust background information bothering on the keywords in the title. Most of the references included in this study are old, it is expedient that author(s) add more recent and relevant references. This section is too short. Please, kindly include the gap in knowledge that this study is set to fill in literature using recent and relevant references here.</b></p> <p><b>Please, rewrite the methodology section in a more comprehensive and understandable manner. The results are not presented in a conventional way making the tables or figures follow the results. In this study, there is no discussion section. His is conspicuously missing here. You are expected to critically and empirically compare the results of the findings in this study with that of the previous studies in literature to support or refute that of this study using recent and relevant references. This is missing in this manuscript.</b></p> <p><b>Please, add some recommendations emanating from this study after the conclusion.</b></p> <p><b>Thank you.</b></p>	As per the reviewer's comment, changes have been made in the manuscript. More relevant information has been added to the abstract, result and discussion, conclusion and reference section. Changes in table has not been made as they are presented in that way to save unnecessary lengthening of manuscript.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	