



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_50815
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Microcredit on Poverty Reduction among Rural Farm Households in Northeast, Nigeria
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>)

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 manuscript is well-established. Its language is clear and understandable. Introduction part of the study indicates the purpose, aim and the objectives of the paper. Background of the paper is adequate. "Abstract" is emphasizing the objectives and the scope of the research clearly. The article is based on a research, so it has a proper and acceptable method. The article is an original paper comprising the results of a research. The subject is original and relevant for the journal which also comprises interesting data for the reader.</p> <p>Not all the references are typed in consistent with those formats requested by the Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology, it is suggested that the author(s) check the references carefully and make the needed corrections to fit the journal criteria.</p> <p>World Bank, 1999; NBS, 2011; Copestake, 2002; doesn't exist in references.</p> <p>Copestake, 2007 doesn't exist in manuscript.</p>	
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	<i>Tuğba Kiper</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Tekirdağ Namık Kemal Üniversitesi, Turkey</i>