Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
ManuscriptNumber:	**Ms_AJAEES_88518**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Impact of Cluster Front line demonstration in Black gram at Pudukkottai district of Tamil Nadu**
Type of the Item	**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)

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)
CompulsoryREVIEW comments	**Theme:**Apparently, the topic does not seem original, since it is understood that there are studies on this topic; neither do the authors justify their originality in the discussion. It could perhaps be understood as original as it does not exist in this area, but this must be demonstrated referentially. **Summary:**The objective should be written in the infinitive ar, er ir: Prioritize the organization of first-line demonstrations in groups to maximize the productivity of the legume crop. It is not necessary to conceptualize each of the elements in this section. It is recommended to write in a single paragraph. Objective, method, result, are guides to be able to write the abstract in the past tense. **Keywords:**Using the UNESCO Thesaurus allows a better location of the article in a universal academic language: Horticulture – vegetable products – legumes... **Introduction:**The antecedent gives an account of the study to be carried out, in this section it is described what is known about the problem and where it should be approached; Although the justification is not very broad, it accounts for the work to be done. It would be important to mention the objective of the study and the hypothesis that has been proposed for this case. **Methodology:**The antecedent gives an account of the study to be carried out, in this section it is described what is known about the problem and where it should be approached; Although the justification is not very broad, it accounts for the work to be done. It would be important to mention the objective of the study and the hypothesis that has been proposed for this case. **Results and Discussion:**The results show a clear reading of his analysis. In the discussion, the comparison of their own conclusions with those of other authors is not noted, taking into account that the author(s) indicate that there have been studies in this area; What is new found in this study is not highlighted since it makes visible a statistical analysis that is very good, but it is necessary to describe the contribution found in this research process; It is important to state why these findings are scientific evidence?; it is recommended to indicate the possible lines of research that can be generated from this study; In addition, it is important to indicate if there were inconveniences in this study process, if any. This section must be worked with bibliographic sources that account for the seriousness of the study. **Conclusions:**The conclusions are adjusted to the stated objective; It is recommended to pay attention to how a conclusion is made since it accounts for the results to meet the proposed objective, but not, it should be referenced since this is part of the discussion, justification or methodology. **Bibliographic references:**The references support the foundation of the study in an academic way, in this case, they are not enough since at least between 40 - 50 references would be needed. However, the requirements of the journal to be published must be taken into account.	
MinorREVIEW comments		
Optional/General comments	\	

Review Form 1.6

	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?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Jverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor**
Department, University & Country	**Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador**