Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_126254**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Entrepreneurial Attributes Of Members Of Self Help Groups (Shgs) Involved In Microenterprise Development**
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**Small and medium-sized businesses are an important foundation for a country's economy. Schools and professional training centers generate consistent and lasting results, creating an entrepreneurial culture. Studies in this area can provide government entities with support for economic policies. Therefore, the topic is of great relevance.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**I suggest the title: ATTRIBUTES REQUIRED FOR ENTREPRENEURS OF SELF-HELP GROUP (SHG) MEMBERS INVOLVED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MICROENTERPRISES**	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	**The abstract is comprehensive and gives a general idea of the work done.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**The subsections and structure of the manuscript are sufficient for the topic.**	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**In the METHODOLOGY subsection it would be interesting to talk about the characteristics of the 60 judges, such as areas of activity, expertise, etc. Also in this same subsection, there should be a more detailed explanation of the 12 entrepreneurial characteristics used.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**The references are sufficient and current for the topic.**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**I believe the quality of the language/English of the article is adequate.**	
Optional/General comments	**To improve understanding, in addition to tables, there should be graphs and figures. Visual understanding would enrich the work. Regarding discussions and conclusions, it is necessary, if possible, to make a brief comparison of improvements from the current status to a previous one.**	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Fabio Papalardo**
Department, University & Country	**Universidade Paulista – UNIP, Brazil**