

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_105542
Title of the Manuscript:	Employment and Income pattern of farm households in Northeast India: Has COVID-19 lockdown hindered?
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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>1. Yes.</b> Specific Comments to the authors: 1. Title: Good. 2. Introduction: theoretical approach + results need a better explanation. 3. Why it is important to study one country, India? What are the reasons for choosing it? 4. Literature review: missing. 5. Methods: are not described in sufficient detail to understand the approach used. 6. The authors should include some additional and appropriate statistical tests. 7. Interpretations: much improvement and needs to be a reasonable extension of the results 8. Conclusions: need to be much improved. Policy implications? Limitations? 9. The paper has a lot of grammatical mistakes and errors. 10. The paper can benefit from language editing and proofreading. Results: The results do not fully describe the outcomes represented in the results table. The authors must motivate their discussion on results with further empirical support and align their results with the existing theories described earlier in the study.</p> <p>Other comments: The study is redundant at many places and appears to be unnecessarily long. The authors might try to reduce the length of their study by removing redundancies while keeping the organization intact. There are some spelling mistakes across the text with minor grammatical mistakes. The authors also appear to use slangs, which should be carefully reviewed for consistency with the academic style of writing. This research is heavily involved in the econometric application rather than using an appropriate economic theory and testing the hypotheses drawn from it. The econometric model is flawed. The dependent variable should be clear and understood. Similarly, the other independent variables should be related to the other variables of the study. Thus, lending rates for the economic sector should be used as explanatory variables. As it stands, this manuscript cannot be accepted for publication in the current journal until the authors complete all the required comments. On the other hand, I would suggest to the author(s) to compare their results with the results of similar works. The "Data and Method" section is not clearly presented. In order to be replicated by other authors in their future research and to be very easy to understand by the readers, I recommend the authors to present the main steps of the research methodology. This presentation must be accomplished only by theoretically point of view, with no other interferences.</p> <p>The manuscript is relatively not well-structured and also not easy to follow. There are some issues with this paper that need to be addressed. The research questions are missing, that negatively influences the clarity of the purpose of the research.</p> <p>The abstract is somewhat confusing because it contains some redundancies, and it lacks a clear line of argumentation: Problem Statement. Research Questions. Placement in Relevant Scientific Fields. Methodology. Key Findings. Contribution. Therefore, I recommend that the abstract should be rewritten. The linkage between the manuscript's objective and why the research was necessary was not well established? The Introduction could do more to ground the paper's in the debate and the related literature.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>In the actual manuscript, scant attention is given to a theoretical derivation of the study and its actual positioning. Indeed, the lack of studies cannot be considered sufficient motivation for this study.</p> <p>I encourage authors to carefully consider and incorporate the suggested articles for the manuscript quality improvements and justify where necessary.</p> <p>I would also suggest that the authors build their literature review regarding the field. It is not clear how this paper contributes to the extant literature.</p> <p>I suggest rewriting the introduction part and critically analyzing the literature separately.</p> <p>The literature review is not thorough as should be, so the reader is not given an adequate background about the topic.</p> <p>Although the literature is not adequately written in the introduction section, it offers no new information and no new slant on the topic. Most of the content in the manuscript is well known by the readers of the journal.</p> <p>The paper is not rich in data as should be, and many method choices were made concerning that. However, it is difficult to follow and understand your method choices as structured now. I suggest that you start with an overview of the research process have a section for each stage which includes discussion/subsections on your research strategy, data collection techniques, and data analysis.</p> <p>Although, the authors have done a good job in explaining the methodology. I am particularly curious to know why they chose the statistical method. What is the unit of analysis? What sampling methodology you use!</p> <p>The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Moreover, the conclusions reached are far from what one can infer from the empirical results. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature.</p> <p>The conclusion section is short somehow and needs to be emphasized and strengthen well. The authors should include only the conclusion that were originated from research and which are relevant for the paper. Conclusion section requires major revision. Also, provide some future research direction in the Employment and Income pattern of farm households in India with some study limitations! I would highly suggest the authors reviewing as many as possible published articles by the targeted journal, to observe the requirement of the targeted journal before submission.</p> <p>A professional English language proofreader is advised before resubmission. The introduction section is not good written, and needs more clarifications and explanations. The writing style, for example, some paragraphs are just three sentences and others are too long. Please make your writing consistency.</p> <p>Abstract: I suggest authors to rewrite the abstract to make it more constructive. Abstract should have at least one sentence per each: context and background, motivation, hypothesis, methods, results, conclusions.</p> <p>The introduction part of the study needs improvement and story flow and the authors need to give proper contributions to their study.</p> <p>There is a need to do a more rigorous and systematic literature review. The authors should clearly mention the literature gap.</p> <p>I would like to suggest that authors should update the introduction, literature, and results part. Specifically, the latest research trends, and in order to highlight the academic frontier of the research, the references of the recent year need to be referenced.</p> <p>How did the authors get from the theoretical model to the empirical one? Behind the model there need to be a complete and well-thought-out theoretical grounding. This part of the article shouldn't include any citations or references; rather, it should be structured according to the authors' reasoning. The empirical model will come when this part has been completed.</p> <p>The authors have only presented the findings, with no explanation of their economic reasoning. Do these findings validate or disprove the current policy framework? Are any new policy measures planned as a result of the findings? Discussion of the findings, which is conspicuously absent here, is meant to spark debate on policy. If the results don't offer anything new in terms of theory or policy, then a simple comparison with the literature won't prove their originality.</p> <p>It would be appropriate to indicate future research directions and limitations of this at the end of the conclusion section just before references.</p>	
--	--	--

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>Poor references format: authors should address this issue in the revised draft. Kindly follow the right style of citation (references) throughout the manuscript by checking the guidelines of journal or any previously published paper in the journal.</p> <p>Please think about the significance of the implications of the study. What message do you want to deliver and how will the reader benefit from your paper? So please enhance the conclusions.</p> <p>I have noticed some good points, but the literature review needs to be built well, so I suggest including more recent studies about topic of the study.</p> <p>Also, some of the in-text citations needs further improvement. The authors should check the journal template and be assure that all requirements have been considered. Also, the paper should be re-edited to fix its errors in both punctuation and grammar.</p> <p>Please send the equations related to steady state and first-order condition.</p> <p>The manuscript must describe a technically sound piece of scientific research with data that supports the conclusion.</p> <p>Experiments must have been conducted rigorously, with appropriate controls, replication, and sample sizes. The conclusion must be drawn appropriately based on the data presented.</p> <p>Some fresh related studies should be included in this study.</p> <p>There are some sections that are not in their proper section and this should be revisit, and it should be move to the appropriate session of the study.</p> <p>The study is not unpinned by any theoretical framework which underplay the validity of the result obtained. Theories about employment and income pattern in India, random walk or technical analysis would have suffice.</p> <p>The discussion session should compare result obtained to existing result and alignment or otherwise with existing theories. The discussion session can be more robust.</p> <p>The methodology employed need to be detailed and systematically explained.</p> <p>My suggestion is also to fully rewrite this section in order to answer the following questions: - Why is this topic relevant, and what is known about it? - Which are the gaps you plan to address and how do you problematize them? - How do you plan to close/address those gaps? - Which are the main contributions of your study?</p> <p>The study will provide a beneficial information about employment and income pattern in India and if they need more protection? and also policy makers mainly in effect of environmental information on the cryptocurrency investors in the study area. However, the following suggestions above should be put into consideration and further action in order to enhance the quality of the paper.</p> <p>Yes, there are many works that have been ignored by the authors related to the topic of this study. I advise the authors to add more studies related to the targeted journal. Some fresh related studies should be included in this study.</p> <p>It would be appropriate to indicate future research directions and limitations of this at the end of the conclusion section just before references.</p> <p>The author has presented a concise literature review in the introduction part only. The study does not feature a specific section with a literature review. The author could have easily included the literature review part focusing on the recent literature pertaining to the adoption of employment as income pattern alternative. Why?</p> <p><b>2. Yes.</b>  <b>3. No.</b>  <b>4. No.</b>  <b>5. No.</b>  <b>6. No.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>No.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nemer Badwan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al-Zaytona University of Science &amp; Technology, Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute, Palestine</b>