

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1-The topic of the article is interesting.</p> <p>2- the researcher could study the economic, social, cultural, environmental, policy-making, etc. variables in it so that the research results indicate practical and practical solutions.</p> <p>3- The abstract of the article is poorly written due to the lack of use of appropriate statistical methods.</p> <p>4- The introduction is very poorly written and is mostly an operational definition. Is the number of 5 sources suitable for a scientific article? It is better to add at least 20 up-to-date sources with coherence to the topic of your article.</p> <p>5- The research method is weak because the researcher could use statistical tests such as correlation and regression. The researcher mentioned that this research was done on the Likert scale. Has this variable been ordinal as it has been studied in the Likert scale? So why haven't you used non-parametric tests? You could define the independent variables of economic, cultural, educational, social, and policy-making, and investigate the barriers and facilitators of the desire to migrate using statistical methods.</p> <p>6- The researcher has only explained the tables, the interpretation of these results should be written.</p> <p>7-In the conclusion and discussion section, the researcher should compare the results of his research with other researchers. In this part, the researcher did not do this. Where are the proposed solutions based on the research results? Suggestions have not been written.</p> <p>8-Appropriate statistical methods have not been used and the results are not complete.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Azita Zand</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>Islamic Azad University, Iran</b>