

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_123426
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of educated unemployed rural youth towards entrepreneurial activities for self-employment
Type of the Article	

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 feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript addresses a highly relevant issue—unemployment among educated rural youth and the role of entrepreneurship as a potential solution. Given the increasing focus on sustainable rural development and job creation, this study offers important insights that could help shape policy and programmatic interventions. However, the study would benefit from a stronger theoretical framework and clearer hypotheses to make a significant contribution to the scientific community. Overall, the topic holds promise, but improvements in methodology and analysis could enhance its impact.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is somewhat descriptive but could be more precise to better reflect the content of the study. A more appropriate title might be: "Perception of Educated Unemployed Rural Youth Towards Entrepreneurship as a Path to Self-Employment: A Case Study in Khordha District, Odisha" This reflects the key focus areas while being more specific about the context and purpose of the study.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is clear in outlining the objectives and methodology but lacks depth in summarizing the results and implications. I suggest adding a brief mention of key findings, especially concerning the influence of socio-cultural factors, family support, and perceived barriers to entrepreneurship. Additionally, the conclusion could emphasize the potential policy implications more strongly.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript is generally appropriate, with clear sections on methodology, results, and discussion. However, the introduction lacks a solid theoretical foundation and a more thorough review of relevant literature. This would help provide context for the hypotheses and research design. Moreover, the discussion section could delve deeper into interpreting the findings and their broader implications for rural entrepreneurship.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically sound in terms of its methodology, particularly the use of proportionate random sampling and statistical analysis. However, the hypotheses are not well-formulated, and there is a lack of depth in the interpretation of data. The results are presented well, but the connection to the broader literature and practical applications is weak. Incorporating a stronger discussion of the theoretical underpinnings and linking the results more effectively to real-world interventions would make the study more robust.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references are relatively sufficient but could be updated to include more recent and relevant studies on rural entrepreneurship and youth unemployment. Including references to established theories such as the Theory of Planned Behavior or studies on entrepreneurial intentions among rural youth would strengthen the manuscript's academic rigor.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Language Quality: The language is generally clear, but there are minor grammatical issues and awkward phrasing that could benefit from proofreading. For instance, some sentences are too long and could be broken down for clarity.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Pilot Study: More detail about the pilot study's findings and how they informed the final research design would enhance the methodological robustness.</p>	
<p>(Major and Minor comments)</p>	<p>Major Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of Theoretical Framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The study does not provide a robust theoretical foundation. The absence of reference to established theories in entrepreneurship, such as the Theory of Planned Behavior, weakens the academic grounding of the paper. 2. Unclear Hypotheses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The hypotheses are too broad and lack clarity. They need to be more specific and measurable, particularly in terms of what is meant by "better perception." 3. Underdeveloped Discussion Section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The discussion of results is not sufficiently thorough. The rankings of perceptions are presented, but their significance in the context of rural entrepreneurship and policy implications are not fully explored. 4. Gender Analysis is Lacking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Although gender is included as a variable in the correlation analysis, there is no detailed exploration of how gender affects entrepreneurial perception. This could be a critical factor in rural entrepreneurship. 5. No Qualitative Data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The study only uses quantitative data, which limits the depth of understanding. Qualitative interviews or focus group discussions could provide more nuanced insights into the perceptions of rural youth. 6. Weak Policy Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The policy implications are vague and do not provide specific recommendations based on the findings. Stronger, more targeted policy suggestions are needed to guide practical applications of the research. 7. Geographical Limitation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The study is confined to two blocks in Khordha district, limiting the generalizability of its findings. Expanding the geographical scope in future studies would improve the representativeness of the results. <p>Minor Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limited Literature Review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The literature review does not sufficiently cover prior research on rural entrepreneurship, youth unemployment, or the role of family and socio-cultural factors. A more extensive review would help situate the study within the broader field of entrepreneurship research. 2. Presentation of Data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The tables are dense, and the data presentation could be more accessible. Visual aids like graphs or charts could help synthesize the information better and make the findings easier to understand. 3. Pilot Study Description: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The details about the pilot study are too brief. Expanding on what was learned from the pilot and how it informed the main study would provide more context to the methodology. 4. Limited Focus on Community Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The study mentions family support, but community and peer support for entrepreneurship in rural areas could also be explored more deeply as key influencing factors. 5. Overuse of Tables: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The results section relies too heavily on tables without enough synthesis in the text. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>The use of visual summaries or highlights of key data points would make the results more engaging.</p> <p>6. Conclusion Could Be Stronger:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The conclusion reiterates findings without adding new insights or connecting them deeply to broader policy implications. Expanding this section with more forward-looking suggestions would enhance the paper's impact.	
--	--	--

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Subash Kumar Bhattarai
Department, University & Country	Nepal Engineering College, Nepal