

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>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. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community because it indicates a significant impact on the community and on academic studies.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable for this article.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive but the author should indicate the objective related to the title, method of sampling used, sample size used, results in summary for the listed objectives, and some short conclusion.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript should be improved appropriately</p> <p>5. The manuscript should be scientifically correct when it indicates for example a clear problem statement, description of the study area, sampling methods used, sample size, analytical methods used, and discussion referred to some previous current studies.</p> <p>6. The references should be revised well and use not old references like those of more than 20yae. It should be better to use references of not more than ten years. It should also be better to have a reference of this format: Name(s) of Authors, year, Title of article/Paper, Pages(APA) format.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The author should revise the article grammatically to be more suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Partially accepted and full accepted after minor correction of all comments.</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:	Gaspard Ntabakirabose
Department, University & Country	Rwanda