



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_44078
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF SWARNA SUB1 RICE VARIETY GROWERS IN CHANDAULI DISTRICT OF UTTAR PRADESH
Type of the 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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The thematic area is very interesting and contemporary. The author(s) have made effort to clearly animate and discuss the issues. However, the following observations are made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 6: take off the extra spacing between verity growers in the abstract. Also, at the level of the abstract, include the sampling procedure, key recommendation(s) and key terms below the abstract. Line 22-24: Submergence annually, however, affects more than 7 million ha of rice in India. Of the total of 2.3 million ha of flood-prone rice lands in eastern India, eastern Uttar Pradesh alone has million ha. <p>Comment: substantiate the above statement by including the source.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The problem that has necessitated the research has not been clearly defined. The background information should enhance to portray the evolution of the problem. The sampling procedure is not very clear. How were the respondents selected and why? What criteria was used for the selection. The tables in the manuscript are source less. Include the sources. Line 108: the study has to clearly define who an illiterate is. This word has been used to describe a category of people in the study. The fact that one has no formal education do not necessarily make illiterates. I suggest a more appropriate word to be used. Line 113: table 1.4. Table shows that total size of <p>Comment: Either use The table shows that or Table 1.4 shows that not "table show that"</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No in text citation. You have included a list of references with no sources cited in the text. <p>In all, it is a good write-up. I commend the efforts of the author(s). The aforementioned observations are my objective take of the manuscript.</p>	
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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Takwa Abonwi Chenea
Department, University & Country	Pan African Institute For Development West Africa, Cameroon