

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_99506
Title of the Manuscript:	Social Betterment and Economic Empowerment of Sericulture Farmers in Northern Hilly Zone of Karnataka, India
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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. The article explain the socio-economic status of sericulture farmers and about the factors that empowerment the farmer to increase the production.  2. I saw the title is suitable.  3. The abstract is too long and the author used many abbreviations that supposed not to use also the author likely to divides the abstract into: introduction, Material and methods, results and discussion.  4. The subsection and structure is appropriate only he must differentiate or partition the result and discussion  5. The manuscript is scientifically correct  6. The reference is very poor and somewhat old reference and there is few reference, he must use more references and I mention the locations of these reference on manuscript.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ahmed F. Hameed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al Mustansiriyah University, College of Medicine, Iraq</b>