

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_81783
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Microfinance in Functioning of Women Self-Help Groups (SHG) Under Bank Linkage Programme in the Rayalaseema Region of Andhra Pradesh
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In the literature review, a tidier summary can be made. First determine what theory or concept will be explained, then combine several similar studies in connected sentences. If it is made with the current format, the reader does not understand the flow and the material presented is separate and unrelated between each item.</p> <p>"</p> <p>In methodology is written: "In Andhra Pradesh, there are 8,19,855 self-help groups". Please Verify the statement.</p> <p>Please explain why you choose the Rayalaseema region of Andhra Pradesh as your reseach object</p> <p>In the suggestion section, in giving suggestions, the author should provide a reason why the suggestion was given so that readers understand the author's reasons.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	In the results and discussion section, the author can add analysis related to the results obtained. Currently mostly only results are presented without analysis given	
Optional/General comments	Ideologically, this research is interesting. But because it was done qualitatively, there was a lot of information that was not conveyed in the discussion section. So that there are some conclusions that the author draws, the reader does not know in detail why it happened.	

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:	Charly Hongdiyanto
Department, University & Country	Universitas Ciputra Surabaya, Indonesia