SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_59017**
Title of the Manuscript:	**AGRICULTURAL CREDIT, A CRITICAL INPUT ON FARMERS INCOME: A STUDY FROM NAYAGARH DISTRICT OF ODISHA**
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/journal/10/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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**- Abstract need to be improved and further suggested to add implications of the research.** **-Spelling mistakes need to be fixed.** **-Background of the study in the context of agriculture credit is also need to be incorporated in the introduction section.** **- Statement of problem is also missing in the introduction part.** **- The methodology is not fully synchronised as it is different in abstract from methodology section.** **- The results need to be supported (or even contradicted results) by the latest scholarly work.** **- Conclusion is missing although sub heading is there but only suggestions are mentioned.** **- The author (s) is suggested to follow the style of citations as prescribed by the Journal.**	**-Abstract has been modified in the revised manuscript** **-Spelling mistakes has been fixed in the revised manuscript** **- Background of the study in the context of agriculture credit has been incorporated in the introduction section in the revised manuscript** **-Statement of problem has been added in the introduction part in the revised manuscript.** **-Methodology has been kept as such in the revised manuscript as the work has been done in the same line and to me it seems fully synchronised as in abstract** **-The result has been supported by some more scholarly work in the in the revised manuscript** **-Conclusion has been added in the revised manuscript** **-APA format is followed in the revised manuscript**
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The paper needs to be improved as it is lacking clarity and scientific soundness.	All the major comments have been taken due care in the revised manuscript

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	