

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_89605
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON THE IMPACT OF MICROCREDIT ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS 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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract:</b> Methodology related information is too scarce. Sample size and study time should be mentioned at least.</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> Solve the capitalization and punctuation related problem existed all through the text. This introduction section needed to be improved. No in text references were added in this section. However, Research gap or rationale of the study were not clearly stated in the later part of the introduction.</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b> Some discussion should be added on the research design of the study. In this format, difference between control and treatment group is not cleared.</p> <p><b>Results:</b> In this section author mentioned about null hypothesis, Ho (Table 1). But details of the null hypothesis were not mentioned in the manuscript. Table 1: Just measuring the association or correlation may not properly reveal the impact of the programme. There must have a methodological explanation. The sign author used on the Chi-square value may not express it was insignificant result. So, author should check the results in such similar cases. Presentation of the results should be improved. May be one table for showing all the results was not enough for this study.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> The conclusions drawn on the manuscript were not well presented and discussed in the results section. In fact, some conclusion is not matched with the results or objectives of the study.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Few more comments are also added on the manuscripts.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Md. Hayder Khan Sujan
Department, University & Country	Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Bangladesh