Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_85903**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evaluation of GST impact on the manufacturing organizations in South-East Rajasthan.**
Type of the 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)

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	**The work was a good conception that will contribute meaningfully to this aspect of knowledge supposing it was well researched on but the major challenge is the way the research was carried out.** **1. The abstract was poorly written thus did not represent a summary of the work.** **2. The introduction was clustered without source references.** **3. No any substantiated literature review.** **4. The objectives of the study were not stated in clarity.** **5. The statement of problem should be clearly stated** **6. No source citations.** **7. The 'sampling/ sub-head is suppose to be the research methodology.** **8. What was called discussion of results was presentation and analysis of data so there should be a new sub-head 'discussion of results' as indicated under which the result will be thoroughly discussed.** **9. The referencing pattern was inconsistent.** **10. The author(s) should also work on the tenses.** **On the other hand, the researcher(s) should be commended on the ways the data collected were presented. To this end, the advice is that much time and concentration should be given to the work considering the good data collected and make it a suitable research work.** **Finally the author(s) should apply the recommendations as indicated in RED delete the underlined words and use the corrections as guide to properly up-date the study.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The author(s) should work with the comments in red.	

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:	**Onwubiko, Emmanuel. C**
Department, University & Country	**The University Library, Alex Ekwueme Federal University, Nigeria**