

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_114454
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON SAVINGS BEHAVIOUR IN HOUSEHOLDS OF SMALL FARMERS IN RAIPUR DISTRICT (CHHATTISGARH)
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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>A STUDY ON SAVINGS BEHAVIOUR IN HOUSEHOLDS OF SMALL FARMERS IN RAIPUR DISTRICT Yes, a study focusing on saving behaviour of small scale farmers is very relevant and well suited for the current scientific community.</p> <p>The title is very suitable and clear on key variables of focus.</p> <p>The abstract is not comprehensive, I would suggest the researcher to include a summary of research methodology, findings, and recommendations.</p> <p>Yes, well appropriate.</p> <p>Yes,</p> <p>Some references are very old dated 1990s. The researcher can look for the current literature.</p> <p>The purpose and objectives of the study need to come out very clearly. In the section on methods and materials information about the actual total target population is missing, sampling technique used is also missing. The recommendations from the findings can also be provided. The results are well provided but the discussions are missing. The researcher should void repeating the data in the tables word for and instead discuss them. The literature agreement or disagreement with the researchers' findings is missing also. As show that the researcher reviewed all the relevant literature.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is adequate.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The researcher can be briefly summarize the ethical requirement put in place to ensure privacy, confidentiality and security of the respondents and the data collected</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:	Judy Mwangi
Department, University & Country	Mount Kenya University, Kenya