

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_100697
Title of the Manuscript:	Linking social innovation with inclusive transformation of agri-food system in Nepal: A review
Type of the Article	Minireview 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The topic's likeability to gain interest over time presents a positive outlook as the subject is grounded on day-to-day life holding relevant and informative insights towards understanding social innovation with inclusive transformation of agri-food system within the Nepal context and beyond.</p> <p>2. Title is suitable.</p> <p>3. Abstract needs minor revision some statements are not clear.</p> <p>4. Manuscript structure, precisely the frameworks need to come before the results and discussions so the work follow can be comprehensively understood.</p> <p>5. Manuscript does present as scientifically correct BUT needs some minor corrections.</p> <p>6. References limited: the study has not fully captured recent studies within the current years of (2020-Todate) ---new studies project acknowledgement of transformations with regard to the subject of study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>- Language of debate has been articulated.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>- The study is good but needs minor corrects.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juliet Angom
Department, University & Country	Amrita School for Sustainable Development, Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, India