

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_102107
Title of the Manuscript:	Resource use efficiency of Vermicompost production under Gothan and Godhan Nyay scheme in Chhattisgarh
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>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> It is important to the scientific world</p> <p><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> The title of the article is suitable</p> <p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> The abstract does not make sense due to lack of proper information in the methodology</p> <p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate but lack proper coordination.</p> <p><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The manuscript is scientifically correct because of its nature and references cited and listed, but the views of the author are not well coming out.</li> <li>▪ The tables must clearly <b>show the statistics</b></li> <li>▪ I encourage the author(s) to critically revisit the methodology.</li> <li>▪ The research is easy to follow when the methodology is properly written. This methodology is incomplete.</li> <li>▪ How did you analyze the data</li> <li>▪ The variables are not clear</li> </ul>	
<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>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This is a important manuscript but the author(s) need to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improve on the tables to look scientific</li> <li>▪ The conclusion must be brief and to the point</li> </ul>	

**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>Felix Mereka Chipojola</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Malawi</b>