

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_86599
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of PM-Krishi Samman Nidhi Yojana in Karnataka
Type of the Article	Scientific 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>)

Review Form 1.6

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>The title can be reformulated (the notion of performance implies indicators of its analysis - for example, product indicators can be established and highlighted; efficiency indicators; result indicators); the paper follows more the way in which the funds were allocated / accessed);</p> <p>The summary must be rewritten, specifying the objective, the research methods applied and the results obtained (not in the form of a percentage distribution of the fund).</p> <p>Keywords must be completed - for example, to highlight the applied research method</p> <p>The structure of the paper must be specified in the introduction</p> <p>Literature review section missing (number of bibliographic references is very small)</p> <p>It is correct $u = \text{Error term or } e^u$?</p> <p>The application of the CAGR model is not clearly explained</p> <p>The conclusions section should highlight the limits of research and future research directions; in fact, the first part of the conclusions could be detailed in a separate section; "Discussions"; (The conclusions should not be a recapitulation of the results but statements based on scientific arguments and their logical interpretation; in addition, they should highlight the answer to the hypotheses in the Introduction).</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dobrotă Gabriela
Department, University & Country	Constantin Brancusi University of Targu, Romania