



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_58477
Title of the Manuscript:	Association between Selected Independent Variables and Adoption Level of Farmers about Recommended Production Technology of Fennel
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Some part of this study (especially your research method) has relations with "Adoption of Recommended Production Technology of Fennel Cultivation by the Farmers in Nagaur District of Rajasthan, India" which was done by Sunil Kumar Sharma^{1*}, N.K. Sharma² and S. R. Kumawat¹ https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2017.603.115 .Therefore, try to justify some reasons that makes your study more unique than others. Clearly put your study gap in your introduction. Under the research method, the following points should be valued. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The researcher should put the criteria or baseline which was used to classified farmers as large, small and marginal. See page line 8 ❖ There is no any source when the researcher used "prepared list of fennel growing villages"? It should be figurative. See page 3 line 6 ❖ From how many villages and why you used random if the potentiality of funnel production might vary village to village? See Page 3 line 7 ❖ There is no clear identification Nagaur district with other Nagaur place which was put under Nagaur , see page 3 line 2. Your result said that "the education, caste, size of land holding, family type and family size are insignificant "Therefore, why you discussed those insignificant variables in your result and discussion? To me, omit those variables and focus on the variables which are statistically significant. Since the aim of most researches are filling the gap through producing good findings however, this study has no any policy input or recommendation. Therefore, try to add some policy implications/recommendations based on your findings. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is better if there is description of study area under your research method "Research Methodology" is name of course, therefore try to use "research Method" There is no page number In the discussion part, your study is not supported by other scholars who did on fennel and there is poor discussion (e.g. see page 7 line 4-10), in this pages there was two debating ideas but this study simply pass it. Therefore, the study clearly discussed and it should try to use other supportive findings which are directly related with fennel production. 	
Optional/General comments	In general, the paper is good if the given comments are included in its correction.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Getahun Abreham Assefa
Department, University & Country	University of Gondar, Ethiopia