



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_55735
Title of the Manuscript:	SOCIO-ECONOMIC SURVEY OF UTTAR PRADESH, BIHAR AND MAHARASHTRA STATES OF INDIAN CONTINENT
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comments (if agreed with reviewer, corrects the manuscript and highlight <i>that part in the manuscript</i> . It is mandatory that authors should write <i>his/her feedback here</i>)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The main observations on this manuscript</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The interest of the evaluation must be done ex-ante and not ex-post of this dairy development project • This evaluation concerns the social side (analysis of the population structure) in the absence of the economic side as indicated by the title of the manuscript • The author neglects the structure of the population according to the types of economic activities practiced • The evaluation in principle must address the success of this project on its side: consistency, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability • The quantitative and qualitative survey is insufficient to analyze the real situation • The selection criteria of 3000 farmers have not been explained well and we do not know the total number • The number chosen for these regions is not homogeneous between them • The results obtained were not well discussed and only the figures obtained and copied and we see no observation to compare the situation between these regions studied for all the evaluation criteria • Finally, the scientific interest of this study is of less importance and remains local and not universal to add a few things to science. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
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:	Tebani Mohamed
Department, University & Country	Hassiba ben Bouali University of Chlef, Algeria