

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_100856
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN THE CONSERVATION OF RURAL TANKS FOR SUSTAINABLE RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN CUDDALORE DISTRICT, TAMILNADU
Type of the Article	Review 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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, it is important for scientific community with minor revision</b></p> <p><b>Yes, the title is suitable</b></p> <p><b>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive</b></p> <p><b>Yes, it is well structured</b></p> <p><b>Yes, it is scientifically correct</b></p> <p><b>Yes, the references are okay but more recent references should be added</b></p> <p>Kindly rewrite your abstract and conclusion for better understanding and in depth study. Disregard general statement. Let it reflect your findings and cogent contribution to knowledge. This will enhance visibility of your work after publication.</p> <p>Contribution to knowledge, discussion of results and technical content of this work need drastic improvement.</p> <p>More recent references need to be cited. Indicate pictorial view and map of the study area.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Some literatures cited were not listed. Cite more recent references. Kindly check through, cite and list all your references properly. References are inadequate, cite and use recent references between 2012-2022</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Provide source of all your tables and figures.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Oluwadare Joshua Oyebode</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Afe Babalola University, Nigeria</b>