



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_49742
Title of the Manuscript:	TECHNICAL EFFICIENCY OF SELF HELP GROUPS GENERATING POULTRY ACTIVITY IN AMRAVATI DISTRICT OF MAHARASHTRA
Type of the Article	Short Communication

**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>)

**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		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b> need to be rewrite with following elements should be included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Brief introduction on the background of the study</li> <li>2. State your problem statement briefly.</li> <li>3. <b>NEED TO INCLUDE THE OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY</b></li> <li>4. Briefly state the method and highlight the needed results which related to the study.</li> <li>5. The significance of the study.</li> </ol> <hr/> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clearly state the background of the study. Why the author looking at efficiency of poultry industry? Any problems on the technical efficiency level? I believed that your introduction section need to be rewritten so that it will attract the attention of the readers. Lacking in terms of previous studies reviews.</li> </ul> <p><b>Materials and Methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The author did discuss well but lacking of discussion on the results. The author interpret the results without relevant discussions.</li> </ul>	All correction done
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



**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>	