

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_85796
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITES OF SHG's IN EAST AND WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT'S 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is good to read that recent literatures have been covered in this article, but their findings have not been discussed inside the article. It is better to include discussion as one of the sub-heading, where the author could make a mention of his findings with other similar study and explain the reasons descriptively. Note: Though the author has a mention of results and discussion as one of the subheading in this article, I do not find any kind of discussion relating to the findings of this article with similar nature of other articles he has mentioned in the literature. 2. The explanations given under the table have not been professionally done. The analysis and the interpretation needs to be more professional and justifying. The author could concentrate on interpreting the findings and analysis in a professional way as to convince the readers. 3. Problem or research gab is not mentioned anywhere in the research article. I wonder how this research articles is written without the problem statement or research gab. The author has to necessarily explain the same and therefore he is advised to include the same in the article. 4. In research methodology, It is mentioned that two women SHGs were selected in each village. But it is not explained about the method of selection of two SHGs from each village for this study. The author has to explain how these two SHGs are selected as the samples of this study. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper needs to indicate the period of the research study undertaken. 2. It is better to follow the references of APA 7th edition. 3. Future area of research could be cited 4. Limitation could be mentioned 	
Optional/General comments	The article is recommended for publication if the author has to fulfil all the requirements as mentioned above.	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. John Kaviarasu
Department, University & Country	Loyola College, University of Madras, India