

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_89658
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on relationship between Self-Confidence and Risk-Taking Ability among the Doctoral Students of Tamil Nadu Agricultural University
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

### 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>It will be best if the abstract flows without any headings breaking it, The headings like aim, study design and so on is best removed.</p> <p>The pearson table should be included so that the r and p value obatined can be seen. This is the core of the work as seen from the topic and aim of the stuidy. Other analysis are just additional</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Remove initials from citation in second to last paragraph in introduction</p> <p>It will be ideal if the sampling technique used in random selection is stated. E.g if it was simple random, stratified, convienent or purposeful etc used</p> <p>Restructure items 3,4,6 and 8 to be more meaninful</p> <p>The ideal practice is to compare the item mean with a criterion mean of usually 2.5 which is the avaverage mean of the Likert Scale responses of SD, D, A SA. So any item that has a mean greater than 2.5 is accepted as a description of the study sample.</p> <p>It would be good if a short explanation is given on how these low, medium and high categorization was arrived at in methodology section</p> <p>For a more robust work, discussion of results should be done in realtion to findings from previous works that either supports or negates the findings of this research.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The work was able to address the topic and the aim was basically addressed. Almost no grammatical and typing error. The research is good. However the revision comments when addressed will make it better.</p>	

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Stella Eteng-Uket</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria</b>