



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_48762
Title of the Manuscript:	Empirical Analysis on the Impact of Poverty Alleviation by Rural E-commerce on Farmers' Income
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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>This is quite an interesting paper. It needs some editing for language use and to eliminate the unwanted text. The abstract should be improved – spell out fully words and phrases which appear for the first time (i.e. do not abbreviate them) and remove the use of SPSS. Add the main findings.</p> <p>Add more references to the literature review and bring it to a conclusion which indicates the gaps in knowledge that will be investigated by the research. If possible, express the gaps in knowledge as research hypotheses.</p> <p>Consider whether categorical variables (e.g. gender) should have standard deviation reported.</p> <p>Add a discussion section which considers the extent to which knowledge gaps have been addressed by the research. Use this section to highlight the claim to contribution to academic knowledge.</p> <p>The conclusion should incorporate research limitations and suggestions for future research.</p>	<p>Thank you for your encouragement.</p> <p>We have modified the text accordingly</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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>