

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_100037
Title of the Manuscript:	Constraints and Suggestions of the respondents about Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana in East Champaran district of Bihar
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)
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)	1. The author has selected the topic which is really helpful for the farmers of that region. The awareness of such scheme in rural area has to be increased. 2. The title of the article is well prepared and self-explanatory. 3. The abstract of the article can contain suggestions. The population of the said area has to be mentioned in the abstract. 4. The structure and flow of the manuscript is good. 5. Number of respondents are very less. 6. Suggested to have more references for similar schemes.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article is simple and readable but minor grammar mistakes are there.	
Optional/General comments	Author can explain results through graphical representation.	

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:	Pratima M. Bhalekar
Department, University & Country	Ashoka Center for Business and Computer Studies, India