SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_52753**
Title of the Manuscript:	**SOCIO ECONOMIC PROFILE OF FISH FARMERS OF TELANGANA AND USAGE OF MOBILE APPS**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	I would like to say that the topic is really an interesting one but I have some suggestions/comments to make with sole aim of improving the quality of the final publication. These are given below: From the title, the word "socio economic" should be written together as "Socioeconomic" In the abstract, author(s) may need to modify the beginning of this section by Starting like this; "This study assesses (or assessed) the socioeconomic profile of fish farmers in……..." Author(s) should note that there is opportunity of adding up to 5 keywords. From the introduction, author(s) needs to present a very robust background information about this study by critically considering the keywords in the title of this study. Author(s) needs to present gap(s) in knowledge that this study is set to fill and how this will be achieved. Brief information about fish farming in India and the study area from recent and relevant empirical studies need to be included in this section. Brief review of literature about how farmers generally are responding to mobile App usage with special focus on fish farmers should be presented in this section too. From materials and methods section, some methodology ingredients are conspicuously missing in this section like; sampling procedures (how did you select 60 fish farmers?) among others. In the description of the study area, author may include the map of the study area even though it is not compulsory but will definitely add colour to this study. These information need to be included here. I discovered that this study is extensively a descriptive study. In my own opinion, author(s) should present a table that will give comprehensive socioeconomic characteristics of the fish farmers in the study area. Note that brief discussion of the socioeconomic profile of the fish farmers will come first before the Table. Source of all the figures presented in results and discussion section should be include at the bottom of each of this figure. In the discussion section, I did not really understand the way you compare the results of your findings in this study with the already existing empirical studies in literature. Author(s) really need to scientifically compare the results of this study with existing empirical studies either to support the results or refute them, not just to cite references alone. In 3.1.6 Constraints faced by fish farmers, I think author(s) will give us the responses of the farmers (respondents) to the examples of likely constraints they may face. How did you arrive at the listed constraints here? It is important for you to include this information. This could be supported by using table to show the responses of the fish farmers (frequency and percentages) to these likely constraints. Other empirical studies in literature may be used to support the findings or refute them. With this kind of study, I feel some recommendations should emanate from the results of this findings. It is important for author(s) to include some of these recommendations immediately after the conclusion or may feel like merging both the conclusion and recommendations together (Conclusion and Recommendations). Lastly, I will employ the author(s) to include more current and relevant references (2016-2019) in this study to make this article relevant when published in 2019 or any other year deemed fit.	Dear Sir/ Madam, I agree with the reviews and made the corrections in the manuscript as suggested. 1. Changed the word Socio economic to Socioeconomic everywhere in the manuscript. 2. Modified the abstract beginning to "This study assessed" 3. Included information about fish farming in India and the study area in the first paragraph 4. Included information on why the study is important in Telangana in 2nd and 3rd paragraph 5. Gaps in the present knowledge have also been added. 6. Regarding mobile app usage, there was no much literature available. 7. Added about the sampling procedure i.e, using the Random sampling method. 8. Added the map of Telangana showing the selected districts in the materials and methods section. 9. A comprehensive table showing socioeconomic characteristics of fish farmers of Telangana has been given in table 2 in the results and discussion section 10. Sources of all the figures have been given under the figures. 11. Frequency and percentages of the constraints faced by the fish farmers as mentioned by them were given in table 3. 12. The sections Conclusion and recommendations were merged and few recommendations were given. 13. Current and relevant references (2016-19) were given.

Minor REVISION comments	Nil	
Optional/General comments	Nil	

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)*	There are no ethical issues.