

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_78274
Title of the Manuscript:	Social Impact of Primary Agricultural Co-operative Societies (PACS) in Nadia District of West Bengal
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. The motivation of this research is not clear and is lack of a story line. As the author noted a fact that PACS helped farmers in improvement of their livelihood and social upliftment (the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph in the introduction), why they do this research and obtain a similar conclusion? Meanwhile, the contribution and innovation of this manuscript is not clear, either. A published paper can't just repeat the fact which has been realized by people.</p> <p>2. I think it would be better to classify the ten indicators into several dimensions since some of them deliver similar meaning. For instance, the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> indicator all reflect the PACS' effect on women's development.</p> <p>3. There are no policy recommendations or some suggestion on the PACS development, which make the whole paper look thin and weak. I think this may result from the unclear motivation and story line in this manuscript. Again, the author needs to dig them up.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>There are some clerical errors in this paper. For example, the 2nd paragraph in the introduction "to what extend (extent)", the last sentence in the introduction "to analysis (analyse/analyze)", etc. Hence, the author needs to check the manuscript carefully</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yue Hu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Hunan University, China</b>