

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_76072
Title of the Manuscript:	Attitude of Panchayat Leaders towards Panchayati Raj Institutions as influenced by their Socio Personal Characteristics
Type of the Article	

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

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>While the researcher did a good job in this study especially in the area of grammatical composition and analysis, it must be stated that he did not follow recognized structure of academic research. For instance the study lack the following research content:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The statement of the problem, which should follow the introduction. (2) The aim and objectives of the study (3) The research questions (4) The research hypothesis, since it is a primary study (5) The theoretical framework which together with the hypothesis should inform the analysis of data (6) The scope/ area of the study/ limitations (7) Literature review and (8) There are no recommendations. <p>The above represents a near perfect structural organization of research studies. The researcher should endeavour to incorporate the above to form a coherent structure of the study.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The researcher adopted inappropriate referencing style especially the first three on the reference list. This should be corrected to confirm with recognized standard of referencing web based materials. This must include the author, date, title of the work, the site it was obtained from and the date it was obtained or visited.	
Optional/General comments	Under the definition of terms the key word Panchayati Raj Institutions was not clarified. While it may be proper for Indians or others who are conversant with the term, it is incumbent upon a researcher to clarify every term especially those that are central to his discussion like the Panchayati Raj Institutions.	

Review Form 1.6

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes, there are a few ethical issues identified in the manuscript. It relates to the researcher's failure to list some of the authors he referred to in his reference list, examples are Thakur (2096); Allport (1935); Thurston's (1946) and Misra and Dakar (2002). I think it is unethical to refer to an author in a research study and fails to list the same in the reference list.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chukwuyem Iharagbon
Department, University & Country	University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria