

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_95963
Title of the Manuscript:	Interest of Women Tea Plantation Workers in different Income Generating activities in Jorhat District of Assam.
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> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The research carried out is descriptive. It has a weak theoretical framework. The article should focus substantially on decision making and support the research in the theoretical framework with this topic. The contribution of the article can be important, however the article has many weaknesses.</p> <p>2. No, therefore I suggest: Decision making of Women Tea Plantation Workers in different Income Generating activities in Jorhat District of Assam.</p> <p>3. The abstract is not clear. It is important that the author specify in the abstract the objective of the research. I recommend the author to structure the abstract including: objective, method, results, conclusions, recommendations.</p> <p>4. The article has a very reduced or scarce theoretical framework. I recommend the author to expand the theoretical framework to support the research. I recommend that the structure of the article be integrated by: Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, and References.</p> <p>5. The manuscript includes only descriptive research. However, the results are interesting. I recommend that the author focus the manuscript on a solid theme such as "Decision making" or another theme related to the results obtained.</p> <p>6. Only 2 of the 6 references correspond to the last 5 years. I recommend the author to use current references and the subject under study. The manuscript must have a solid theoretical support.</p> <p>7. I recommend that the author clarify why he points out "independent variables" when in fact he does not present the "dependent variable". The author should only point to "variables".</p> <p>8. The methodology must include: type of research, population and sample or participants, variables (definition and operationalization), measurement instrument, procedure, data analysis.</p> <p>9. I recommend and invite the author to specify the objective of the investigation.</p> <p>10. The manuscript must have an adequately supported theoretical framework with updated references.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	I recommend the author review and take care of the proper presentation of the references.	
<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juana Patlan Perez
Department, University & Country	National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico