

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_86409
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on Socio-Economic Upliftment of Women JEEViKA beneficiaries and to analyse the constraints faced by them in Begusarai district of Bihar
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:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	1) Teghra block was selected by purposive sampling for the study based on assumption that the block has the largest number of trained beneficiaries. It is assumption or fact? If mere assumption what was it's basis? Where is the reference? 2) Caste , Education , Family type can't be correlated as per As per level of Measurement rule 3) Risk orientation should have been more correlated with Economic Upliftment but is is more with Social upliftment. Explain? 4) Ranking method is faulty. Kindly revisit it's methodology	I agreed with the reviewer, I made all the necessary corrections in the manuscript and highlighted that part with yellow colour. But I didn't agree with the point education can't be correlated because it's because of education social and economic condition of rural women enhanced.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Keywords Should be arranged alphabetically Spelling & grammatical mistake must be avoided as pointed in the MS No specific pattern followed to denote significance level	I agreed with the reviewer, I made all the necessary corrections in the manuscript and highlighted that part with yellow colour.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Better statistics could have been used to reach meaningful conclusions	

### 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)	No, there are no ethical issues in the manuscript.