

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_90159
Title of the Manuscript:	Prospects of Sericulture in border areas of Jammu with special reference to Poonch District
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:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The country of study is not indicated</li> <li>2. Technical language is very poor-structure and organisation of report is not satisfactory. You can not start a sentence like this. "100% of farmers used both approaches"</li> <li>3. Figures are not clear and can be better presented in composite tables</li> <li>4. Very Simplistic analysis- Some regression analysis could boost the quality of the manuscript since this is socio-economic survey</li> <li>5. Some claims are quiet misleading – First line/sentence of abstract. Do you mean in the study country or globally?</li> <li>6. Revise the discussion section- both structure and content. Explain similarities and differences of findings with existing literature and state reasons and implications of findings (do not just presents results)</li> <li>7. The problem statement is not clearly state. State clearly in the introduction the gap your study will fill</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Some references are very old- Try some current references (2012-2022)</p> <p>Restructure according to journal guidelines- it is difficult to follow the various sections in this structure</p> <p>Too many headings in the discussions section. Use a maximum of four major headings</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Relevant work done but can be better	

### 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:	Emmanuel Kombiok
Department, University & Country	University of Energy and Natural Resources, Ghana