



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_68682
Title of the Manuscript:	Constraints Faced and Suggestions Received by Self Help Group Members of Akola District, Maharashtra
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review of literature should be added as a lot of review is available on this topic. 2. Profile of the SHG members (age, education, experience, leadership...etc) is missed in this paper that should be studied in the first phase of the paper. 3. Association of independent variables like age, experience, leadership, education level ...etc on difficulties faced by them will be expressed using Chi-square test. 4. The major constraints and suggestions will be identified with the help of Garrett ranking method or any rank analysis. 5. In results and conclusions, a critical analysis should be done with the already existing results in other studies by quoting suitable reasons. 	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This study is not conducted in a scientific way. Hence it cannot be considered as a scientific study. 2. This study lacks the review of literature which is the one of the roadways of any research work. 3. There is no any strong statistical evidence in drawing the conclusions. 4. Raw and elementary information is provided in the conclusions that contradicts the functionality of the SHGs .(need to check once again). 5. Grammatical errors present in the writeup which cannot give the meaning as they expected. 	

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>P. Lavanya Kumari</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Acharya NG Ranga Agricultural University, India</i>