

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_98018
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of NFSM on income and productivity in Adilabad district of Telangana
Type of the 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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Somewhat. The over all study is limited with contents, importance, analysis, data and interpretation. Title of the article missing a keyword. So. I suggest to modify it as "Impact of NFSM on Productivity and Economic Profit of Redgram in Adilabad district of Telangana" Yes. Somewhat Yes Yes Yes 1. Kindly modify the second line under the introduction. " food security is a must....." 2. Sampling distribution and sampling technique are not clear according to the selection of study area. Hence, author has to make it clear. 3. Author has mentioned a number of statistical analytical tools but ther couldn't find an expected analytical findings. 4. Interpretation given only for table 1. But not for table. 2 a critical interpretation need for it. Check it..	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	T. Amose
Department, University & Country	Madurai Kamaraj University, India