

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_95173</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Usage of Agromet Advisory Services among the Farmers of Y.S.R District of Andhra Pradesh.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original</b>

### 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. It is important but proper analysis has been lacked.</p> <p>2. Title is suitable.</p> <p>3. Abstract is not comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. To be revised/modified.</p> <p>6. References have been mentioned but are between 2011-20.</p> <p><b>Additional Comments:</b></p> <p>7. Results: Nice work. But, again there is insufficient statistical analysis. Besides, finding of %age, nothing else on statistical analysis which gives a weak conclusion. Therefore, some statistical packages be used and balance and counter-balance of the findings be drawn.</p> <p>8. Discussion: It is suggested that while doing discussions, the latest finding and past practices be indicated and linked.</p> <p>9. Conclusions- need to be ended/summed up based on the findings of the work and to be compared with the past work and as well the discussion part.</p> <p>10. There is minor correction of English.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	There is minor correction in English.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	No	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>S. Kerketta</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>