



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_31032
Title of the Manuscript:	Dynamics in Theeramythri Activity Groups: Analyzing coherence among the group members
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Line 41 to 67: There is need for the author to identify the source of the information (reference clearly) and factual statements that they have written otherwise failure to that there is clear indication of plagiarism. Is this the literature review section? It's not clear, can this also be addressed. 2. The methodology section is shallow and does not explain for example why using the purposive sampling. I recommend that this section be revisited so as to give a comprehensive methodological approach to the study. 3. The referencing section is not consistent so the journal requirement of referencing should be adhered to. 4. Can the author add some recent literature	1. Reference has been clearly indicated and it is a review of the literature about SAF theeramythri groups. 2. Methodology sections have been corrected as per your suggestion. 3. Reference section has corrected according to the journal requirement. 4. Recent literature have been added
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Line 13: It <u>have</u> got high impact..... correct to it <u>has</u> got high impact..... 2. Line 22. Spacing after (SHG). 3. Line 101. Very few members....instead of a very few members	All the minor revision comments have been done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		