

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_124059
Title of the Manuscript:	REJUVENATING INDIAN RURAL ECONOMY THROUGH RYTHU BHAROSA KENDRAM
Type of the Article	Appropriate

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The development of Aquicultural Sector is vital for Government's quest for Vikshit Bharat. The author/s of the article has brought out technology and logistic absorption in one district of Andhra Pradesh (AP). The study result indicates positive contribution to farmers in selected areas of AP in many ways.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Appropriate	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is appropriate	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Remove brackets in Introduction. Literature Review is missing in the manuscript in respect of 10 references at the end of the manuscript.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Author/s need to justify sample size of 75 in relation to population under study. Author/s need to indicate method by which random selection was made. Interview to respondents should supplement Questionnaire drawn identifying independent and independent variables. The methods selected for analysis are too simple. The test of hypothesis after setting objectives of the research is advocated with supporting methods.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	10 references in the article are suffice.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Put manuscript for grammar check	
Optional/General comments	None	

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:	Dipak Shantilal Gaywala
Department, University & Country	Parul University, India