

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_92667
Title of the Manuscript:	A scale to measure Migration Proneness of tribespeople
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Title I suggest to change title from : A scale to measure Migration Proneness of tribespeople</p> <p>To: Establishment of a scale to measure Migration Proneness of tribespeople</p> <p>Abstract: You don't mention review in abstract but you can mention only Methods names</p> <p>Change: in the study were Index of discrimination ... To in the study were an index of discrimination</p> <p>Introduction: You have to add more recent review</p> <p>Methodology: Change: From: for quantitative purpose, the scale must hav sufficient content validity in order to get constructive</p> <p>To: for the quantitative purposes, the scale must have e sufficient content validity in order to get a constructive</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS</p> <p>Change: On screening it was found that out of 45, 15 judges marked wrongly.</p> <p>To : On screening, it was found that out of 45, 15 judges were marked wrongly.</p> <p>Chnge: The relevancy index obtained for 29 items are shown in Table 1.</p> <p>To: The relevancy index obtained for 29 items is shown in Table 1.</p> <p>Change: From the Table 1 it was clear that on statements 2,13,14 and 17 have highest relevancy</p> <p>To: From Table 1 it was clear that statements 2,13,14 and 17 have the highest relevancy</p> <p>Change:</p>	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abd El-Rahman Abd El-Raouf Ahmed
Department, University & Country	Agricultural Engineering Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center, Egypt