

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_102568
Title of the Manuscript:	Utilization Trends of the Kisan Credit Card (KCC) Beneficiaries
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important. The writer is bringing out the use of cashless system in agriculture which I believe its scientifically sound. 2. The for the article is suitable 3. The abstract not comprehensive; the writer need to be specific on who are the respondents from the onset, tools for data collection missing and main finding also missing. The key words also not sufficiently addressed; delete KCC and add words like contemporary, utilization, socio – economic, production etc 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is not appropriate. Each objective should have a subsection 5. The introduction has no citation, this makes it scientifically incorrect and inappropriate. Where there is an indication of secondary data like in the introduction, there must be citation, otherwise it plagiarism. Tools for data collection and sampling is weak, address. You need to be very specific; the tool and the study population. Data analysis and interpretation should be organised per objective since you have three objectives. Discussion of the findings not comprehensive. Findings not well organised. 6. The references are not sufficient for instance there is no reference in the whole of introduction. A 14page document should have more than 5 references 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The English language is sufficient and scholarly	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The article is can be improved	

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:	Maurice Manyonge Pepela
Department, University & Country	Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya