

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_97459
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of drug abuse among youth and its association with socio-demographic and risk factors: A growing menace
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>yes</p> <p>yes, but needs to indicate study area.</p> <p>Yes, but needs to improve as suggested below.</p> <p>Yes, but needs to improve as suggested below.</p> <p>Yes, but needs to improve as suggested below.</p> <p>Yes, but needs to improve as suggested below.</p> <p>Please see below a complete comment to the authors.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but needs to improve as suggested below.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p> <p>In the column to the right, I have included the comments I originally prepared to the authors. I hope it is helpful.</p>	<p>While the manuscript attempts to provide relatively more recent, specific, and relevant information on the topic under consideration, it is also associated with certain concerns that need to be addressed, and these concerns are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The title of the manuscript should indicate the location (study region) of the study. • In the abstract, what is written as "Study Design" is not clear and needs to be revised. • In the abstract, the conclusion is mostly repetition of the results, and the last sentence there is vague. It is suggested this conclusion needs to be revised. • In the Introduction and abstract the justification(s) for conducting the present study is not clear. Is the study filling a gap that was not addressed by previous researchers? If so, what was it, and what would be the potential contribution of the current work? • Some key references are missing in the introduction and elsewhere un the paper. • There is repetitiveness of statements in the introduction and elsewhere in the manuscript, which should be minimized. • There is confusion with the use of the words "drugs, "drug abuse" and "drugs of abuse" in the manuscript. • The reviewer wonders if writing the names of the study participants was a requirement for such kind of study. • A brief description the official regulation psychotropic drugs in the region of India can be helpful for better insights. • In table 1, under family income, in what currency was the amount of money listed down considered? • While some sections of the discussion are more of a repetition of the results, the implications and contribution of the reported results are not well discussed. This is important to be given due consideration. • It is suggested that in a separate paragraph in the discussion, authors write down at least some of the important limitations of the study, with inclusion of proposals for possible future investigations in the field. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Overall, the manuscript is not that well-written, making it difficult to clearly understand the rationales behind some of the presentations. This requires that it should be thoroughly edited for language as well as opinions/reasonings.	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Worku Abebe
Department, University & Country	Augusta University, USA