SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_62934**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Knowledge and Attitude of Rural Women towards Agroforestry Practices in Kaduna State**
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/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	**1. Introduction part may be reduced into a brief informative section** **2. Data in table and in inference discussion differs that has to be revised (table 1, table 2, table 3, table 4a, table 5b, table 6)** **3. Agroforestry term should be used in same pattern throughout the manuscript** **4. All the tables should be given the number frequency (n=120) and wherever required multiple response should be mentioned** **5. The maximum and minimum score mentioned in 4a should be evidently given.** **6. Mean score should be calculated and added in Table 5a** **7. Clarify whether the statement on rejecting null hypothesis is correct or wrong** **8. Reference should be given in the prescribed format. Some references lack the format which need to be revised** **9. Some more (one or two) recent review (after 2015) may be included. As the reference quoted are quite very old**	Revision done Noted Done the revision Done
Minor REVISION comments	1. Minor spelling mistakes and grammatical errors need to be revised	Corrected
Optional/General comments	1. In general, the study is a basic social research which has been executed well and written well	

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)*	