



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_45772
Title of the Manuscript:	Study the Profile Characteristics of Farm Women with reference to Decision Making Behaviour
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 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	Introduction: An overview about the places where the research occurred should be provided. Bibliography review (lines 29-40): Please clarify the regions of the cited studies and explain why they are relevant, and clearly tell if they are other studies in the same region of this study. Research Methodology (lines 42-45): Please specify the tool used to collect the information (questionnaire, interviewed or other) and when the field work was done. A brief explanation about the variables should be provided, e.g. why these variables were chosen, the meaning of some of them and how they are measure – eg. Innovativeness or self-confidence. Last, there are no mean, only percentages. Results and Discussion: Line 49-50: which headings? and there are no discussion! Line 56-58: There are no data about the reasons. There is no discussion. Conclusion: Is very poor, is just a short presentation of the data collected.	I have change title so based on that included some relevant information in introduction. Carry out the correction Carry out the correction Carry out the correction
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The article is poor.	I have been added related information to based on your review.



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>	