



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_50503
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF TECHNOLOGICAL INTERVENTION ON YIELD OF SUMMER PEARL MILLET
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>)

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	<p>The paper has an interesting scope due to the importance of the crop specifically for Asian agriculture. There exists need for clarification in some specific parts of the paper. The abstract should be converted into a form that can be easily understood by academics and readers. Some suggestions and questions were indicated within the manuscript under track change mode.</p> <p>Afterwards, the paper can be published. Yet, I would appreciate if I can see the final form.</p> <p>The paper falls between major and minor revision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives, details of the existing and experimental implementations should be provided for ease of academic readers. • Especially comparison with the previous literature in details is essential. • Providing importance of pearl millet for human consumption and animal fodder for the target region should be detailed. • Abstract should be revised due to indication of the research objective and details of farmer practices and potential practices after technology transfer is essential. • The existing technology and proposed technological implementations should be discussed. <p>The difference between highest and lowest yields, indices and gaps should be acknowledged better for comparison.</p>	<p>All the comments was revised</p> <p>Comments No. 9</p> <p>Only one hybrid GHB 732 was allotted during FLDs summer 2019 and It has high dry fodder yield compare to GHB 538. The total rainfall was 697 mm in 2017 so proper irrigation apply in summer 2018 due to source of water available. In 2018, the total rainfall was very low 370 mm as compare to 2017 due to low rainfall two hybrids allotted to farmers GHB 538 (early maturing and lower dry fodder yield compare to GHB 732) and GHB 732.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	