

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_97322
Title of the Manuscript:	Problems of Scheduled Caste Co-operative Societies and their Members - A Qualitative Approach
Type of the Article	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)
Compulsory REVISION 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The paper is somewhat interesting to the scientific community.</p> <p>The research methods were not sufficiently described. Research design was not clearly explained. The sampling technique was not stated. Please rearrange the subsections according to the APA (2020). What is SSLC? An abbreviation needs to be accompanied with a full term. The author should re-format the references according to the APA (2020).</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor changes in grammar.	
Optional/General comments	The quality of the paper is at the acceptable level and should be considered for publication.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sid Terason
Department, University & Country	Kasetsart University, Thailand