

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_79436
Title of the Manuscript:	An analysis on Constraints faced by Scheduled Tribes in access to Social Institutions in Eastern Ghats of Tamil Nadu
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>)

	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>The author failed to follow the structural guidelines for academic research. For instance:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The statement of the problem was not well stated; after the introduction the statement of the problem follows, it is advisable to give it a section even if it is one paragraph for clarity sake. (2) The research question was not stated, it should normally come immediately after the objective. (3) The study lacked any theoretical explanation; every academic research should have a theory underpinning the study, you can adopt institutional theory for this study. (4) There are also no hypothesis or assumptions with which the study could be validated. (5) There is no section dedicated to literature review, as such there are no identifiable gap that should warrant the study. Except no academic work has been done on the subject, then can one be excused. <p>For this study to be published, the researcher should incorporate these aspects of academic research to give it the quality academic works demand.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	I observed that the key words were defined in the section dedicated to Results and Discussions. This is an anomaly, definition of terms or concepts should be dedicated to a section of it's own and not muddled up with Results and Discussion.	
Optional/General comments	The referencing style is not very clear to me, I think the Journal should specify the referencing style it prefer. Either the APA or MLA referencing style should be communicated to all authors for uniformity.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

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