

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_103196
Title of the Manuscript:	Agricultural Schemes in India: A Review
Type of the Article	Review 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p><b>No. Abstract is like an Introduction. There is no line of methodology and scope of the study. So, author has to rectify it with necessary details.</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>1. Where there is a need of symbol( ' ) is not given and where there is no need of (') it is given. Eg. Last line of abstract, second line of Introduction. So, author has to do the necessary changes by readout entire study.</p> <p>2. Author has to check whether the given abbreviations are explained or not? (Some are not detailed).</p> <p>3. In the part of methodology, author has not mentioned that how many articles are read and the classification of literatures. Also not given the number of literatures based on selected policies. Also, it is needed the literatures' coverage period which means the study covered literatures from ? to ? and total coverage years.</p> <p>4. Sources of table no.1 is not given.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>K. Sadasivam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Madurai Kamaraj University, India</b>