

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_95823
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of JeevikaSakhi of DAY-NRLM on improving livelihoods of rural poor in Assam, India
Type of the 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>		
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Write down the paper on the basis of author's guidelines of journal, write down the abstract in a brief like that introduction, objectives, methodology, result &amp; discussion and conclusions. highlight the hypothesis of the work.</li> <li>2. Write down the objectives properly after introduction, because in result and discussion you explained to more than the given objectives.</li> <li>3. In point 3.1 means performance of SHG, there in some point you didn't add the references no. So add the references inside the methodology and result and discussion.</li> <li>4. write down the paper in a brief.</li> <li>5. Its a good analysis of performance and impact of JeevikaSakhi of DAY-NRLM, but add one table for all points of 100% performances results finding in 3.1</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kavita Chopde</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dr.Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, India</b>