

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_109934
Title of the Manuscript:	Attitude of NRLM beneficiaries towards livelihood Diversification in Baghelkhand region of Madhya Pradesh
Type of the Article	

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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Despite the fact that livelihood diversification is an extensively researched topic around the world, it is critical in terms of protecting vulnerable households from environmental and economic shocks. There is no doubt that this manuscript is significant to the scientific community. 2. Yes, the title is appropriate; I have no suggestions for a title. 3. Certainly not. Because the abstract of every paper should quickly include; the problem statement, the objectives of the study, the methodology, the results obtained, and the recommendation. This study, however, lacks objectives, research analysis, and recommendations. 4. Off course, there are no subsections in the article; everything is crammed into the material and technique sections. It is preferable to divide the methodology part into subsections such as sampling technique, data source, data gathering method, and data analysis methods. 5. Of course yes but with some limitations. If the above comments are incorporated by the author/s, the paper can significantly contribute for scientific community. 6. Among the strong sides of the paper, authors used recent references. The vast bulk of references were written within the last five years. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authors should provide proper explanations for their findings rather than simply repeating what respondents said. For example, in the result and discussion section, the authors just provided the rank without explaining why some of the respondents prefer one statement over the others. • In the methods section, the authors should provide enough explanation on a scale that they used to examine farmers' attitudes on livelihood diversification. They must explain what it implies. Higher and lower scores on this measure indicate beneficiaries' level of willingness to pursue livelihood diversification. • You have combined the author writing system with the numbering system in your citation. It is preferable to adopt one strategy while avoiding the other. Consider the introductory section, paragraph 2, lines 15 and 17. • To make the paper more complete, some sub sections such as reasons for adopting livelihood diversification and factors influencing the adoption of livelihood diversification should be included. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Behailu Legesse Kptymer
Department, University & Country	Borana University, Ethiopia