

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_99368
Title of the Manuscript:	Scholastic Difficulty: Scale Development and Implications for Future Research
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 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)	1. Yes, it is important for the scientific community. 2. Yes, it is suitable. 3. Yes, comprehensive. 4. Keywords must be included at the end of abstract. Proper alignment is required. 5. Suggested to include sequence/index numbers for each title and subtitle of article. 6. Recommended to keep numbers for each references in the list. This number must be cited inside throughout the article content. If possible, can add few more references from the recent years since the references are very old from the year 2004 & 2006. In table#2 and table#3, 1 st row is missing and its started from row#2. 7. Suggested to include future enhancements at the end of conclusion to support the future researchers.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Language usage is satisfactory. But, few sentences must be rewritten to avoid grammar mistakes. Also, letter cases and grammar must be checked. 2. All the paragraphs must begin with some Indentation. It's missing in all the paragraph. Suggested to included indentation for each paragraph.	
Optional/General comments	Appreciated the authors for their innovative idea and preparation of this article. I believe that this article can be published after updating the above mentioned compulsory / Major recommendations.	

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 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rajasekaran S
Department, University & Country	College of Computing and Information Sciences, University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Oman