

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_107542
Title of the Manuscript:	An Analysis of Educational and Institutional Security of Farmers: Evidence from Bundelkhand
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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. 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1.The manuscript can be helpful to researchers and the scientific body.</p> <p>2. The author seem not to understand whether to write on farmers, households or diary farmers; as they are used interchangeably. Suggested Title: Analysis of Educational and Institutional Security among Dairy Farmers in Bundelkhand Region, India</p> <p>3.The abstract of the work is nor comprehensive. The title is not include, objectives and hypotheses are not also included while conclusion and recommendation(s) were conspicuously ommitted.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. Since the introduction is not robust enough with explanation of key concepts, a literature review section could have been included. Also the methodology did not explain the study area and was not clear on method of analysis; particularly the operationalization of variables.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct with modifications.</p> <p>6. The references are not sufficient and recent. The entire reference (100%) was more than 10 (&gt; 10) years with the most recent reference being the ones of 2012 (11 years back).</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language/English quality of the article is relatively suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The works is good but lack good flow. It requires modification, updating and better rendition to make good meaning.</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:	<b>Custodian D. Nnadi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Niger Delta University, Nigeria</b>