

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_101433
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND EXPECTATIONS OF ELDERLY CITIZENS: A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY IN JORHAT DISTRICT OF ASSAM</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research article</b>

### **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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><u>Compulsory</u></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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Need improvement (see body of the paper)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Not sufficient and does not follow APA format.</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>The results of the study are explicit as they were not connected to previous studies in the area. The analysis and discussion of result should be reworked on to improve the standard and quality of the paper.</p> <p>N=400 meaning 400 total questionnaires was administered, but the total frequency in Table 1 is 506 and total percentage, which is supposed to be 100% is 126.5%. Kindly check the analysis and do the needful. The analysis is not well articulated and confusing.</p> <p>N=400 meaning 400 total questionnaires was administered, but the total frequency Table 2 is 768 and total percentage, which is supposed to be 100% is 192%. Kindly check the analysis and do the needful. The analysis is not well articulated and confusing.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aminu Umaru</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nigeria</b>