

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJAEES_105432 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Impact of Paramparagath Krishi Vikas Yojana Scheme on the Livelihood of 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>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

| | 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> |
|--|--|---|
| <p><u>Compulsory</u> 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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>There are points for improvement.</p> <p>Yes, they are.</p> <p>There are points for improvement.</p> <p>There are points for improvement.</p> <p>The article deals with a relevant research problem. However, there are some flaws in the analysis due to the weakness of the chosen methodology.</p> | |
| <p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>There are points for improvement</p> | |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> | <p>There is a need for a spelling and typing check.</p> <p>There is a need for a spelling and typing check.</p> <p>It would have been important to define a multifunctional index with a weight for each area evaluated and to compare the values between the two groups (before and after). Why state that the program was successful when there are improvements in some areas and others is up to the researcher to make this statement of success or failure of the program. Furthermore, there is no comparison of results with other studies. How do you know if the areas evaluated are adequate?</p> <p>Therefore, the results should be viewed with caution, given the fragility of the methodology used.</p> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Wellington Ribeiro Justo |
| Department, University & Country | Regional University of Cariri, Federal University of Pernambuco, Brazil |