

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_118882
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT ON FARM INCOME BY JALASAMRUDHI PROJECT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, this MS carry importance for scientific community and falls within the aims and scope of this journal Title is suitable. Authors should add more precise data in term of percentage like how much farm income is increased/ impacted in project area as compare to the non project watershed area. The main key reason of higher income. Structure is fine; however, authors should write the introduction focussing on the Jalasamrudhi project justifying the work giving with more recent references instead of writing in result and discussion section. To add on this, authors should add the location map of study area and should clearly mention in material and method section itself which test is applying based on sample size with clear justification (either z-test or t-test with formulae). The selection sample procedure is not clear as per given in Table 1 in Result and Discussion section. Out of 122 beneficiaries 80 was selected and author should check Table 2 explanation. "In the case of average net income from crops and average net farm income, z- test was used because of the large sample size (n=80). In the case of average net income from livestock, t- test was used because of small sample size (n=27)." Here n is taken again 27, so the author should clear mention while applying the formula and how whether whole sample size is for 80 or different? The author can also add the photograph of the measures taken of the projects (eg. Intercropping of bananas and tapioca farm, poultry water conservation structures of measures untaken) to add more authenticity to the papers. Author did not explain the p-value for average net income from livestock, whether it is significant or not and why? Authors should add more references and recent. References cited are less. It is to state the MS must be rewritten with the correction highlighted in MS and considering the mentioned points to claim publication from your prestigious Journal. I expect that your esteem journal consider the above points positively and publish this manuscript at your earliest. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Average and it is corrected in whole MS.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sanjarambam Nirupama Chanu
Department, University & Country	CAU, KVK, India