Comments

A complete language editing of paper is required to be done as the language is not appropriate and adequate to publish in the journal. For example in the abstract, it was mentioned by the author, "found to had 0.83" and in the introduction there was the author mentioned as " Despite of pandemic situation" which are grammatically wrong. Like this, in many places language and grammatical errors could be spotted

The technical content is very weak and need to be improved to make it amenable for publishing. It was not clear, whether the author intended to concentrate on Attitude of farmers on Privatisied Extension Services or the methodology of Guttman Scalogram Analysis. Further, this methodology is very old and there is nothing new to be reported about the methodology

Though the title reflects the content, neither of the two issues namely PEAS or the methodology of scale construction were fully explained

Though the abstract is summarised the content of the article, it needs more clarity

There is no coherence in the way the introduction was written. The rationale of taking up the study was not established properly in the light of previous findings. The research gap was also not mentioned conspicuously. There were many studies on the same topic which might have been mentioned in the introduction section. There was disconnect between sentences which needs to be patched

1. The author failed to elaborate on why he/she has chosen Guttman Scalogram analysis, while many attitude scale construction methods are available.

2. The sample size is too low to generalise the findings which is not acceptable. What is the profile of thirty farmers and what is the rationale of selecting them did not find a mention in the article

3. The elementary analytical tools used did not justify for the publishing of the content as article. Some more statistical analysis should have been included.

The results are too abstract and the discussion is too general. The researcher should have tried to give some more qualitative information to support the findings. Some good cases where the respondent got benefitted from PAES should have been included. It is highly recommended to revise the manuscript with more in depth discussion with appropriate qualitative information collected from the field

Statistical tools used were very elementary and requires some more tools to be used to make the article more empirically sound

The hypotheses and research questions were not mentioned anywhere in the text

Final Impression

The authors are to be appreciated for having taken a timely subject. Though, the article need to undergo major revisions to make it publishable