



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_35492
Title of the Manuscript:	CONSTRAINTS FACED BY THE FARMERS AND THEIR REMEDIES IN TECHNOLOGICAL ADOPTION OF POTATO PRODUCTION IN FARRUKHBAD DISTRICT (UTTAR PRADESH)
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: (<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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p><b>TITLE:</b> The title is too long and has so many unnecessary key words and if omitted cannot change the meaning. Thus, it need to be reframed and the bracket for <i>UTTAR PREDESH</i> be removed.</p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The introduction failed to explain explicitly what the problem potato farmers suffered was! Is it low productivity? Or resistance to adoption of new technology? If all these are true, why the author explained that, in Uttar Pradesh potato is produced in large scale? It confusing and therefore need to be clearly explained.</li> </ol> <p><b>METHODOLOGY:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The author used interview schedule in collecting data from respondent, this is not the proper tool for a survey with a large sample size of 100 respondents. Interview schedule is mostly used in the FGD or In-interview!</li> <li>3. The collect tool for such study in structured or semi-structured questionnaires supported with interview guide in FGD.</li> <li>4. The programme used for analysis of data is missing in which readers can compare the results to estimates.</li> </ol> <p><b>RESULTS SECTION:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Authors started by presetting tables of results and then followed by explanations. This is not proper in presenting scientific findings; the best way is to start with explanations followed with Tables. If explanation is too long, then table of results may follow immediately after the first paragraph.</li> </ol>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Petro Maziku</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>College of Business Education, Tanzania</i></b>