

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_106117
Title of the Manuscript:	Income generating activities of Self-Help Groups (SHG) members in Mahabubnagar District of Telangana
Type of the 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. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. While the researcher made some attempt at investigating the matter under focus, the piece of work does not manifest the rigour expected of truly scientific research. For instance, right from the beginning, one does not clearly see clarity of purpose as the topic is flat with hardly sufficient variables to communicate intent!</li> <li>2. The title is incomplete. It does not communicate intent clearly. Possible alternative could be; [SHGs and IGAs among poor communities in Mahabubnagar district of Telanagana or Examining SHGs as an engine of Income Generation among poor communities in Mahabubnagar district of Telangana]. This would enable researcher to examine relationship or role as may be appropriate</li> <li>3. The abstract is awfully inadequate. It should reflect; focus of study, purpose/objectives, summary of methodology [design/study population/sample size &amp; derivation/sampling techniques &amp; data collection methods as well as analysis]</li> <li>4. The sub sections and general structure could be improved. For instance, I don't see literature review in the manuscript! Or is it the guideline of your journal to have no literature?</li> <li>5. No, it's not scientifically correct as it manifests quite a number of missing scientific rubrics especially when you look at methodology. Issues are just pieced up without evidence of genesis &amp; barking</li> <li>6. While references could be sufficient and recent, in-text citation requires improvement in general</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	The manuscript should be subjected to language editing before further processing. The abstract for example has some incoherent statement that obscure meaning and intention of the researcher	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	There is need for a comprehensive revision of this piece of work to uplift its standard & worth as a scientific undertaking for sharing with wider community of scholars	

### 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sendawula Noah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nkumba University, Uganda</b>