

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_93676
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception Of Farmers Towards Soil Health Card Recommendations In East Godavari District Of Andhra Pradesh
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	<p>The topic chosen for study is interesting and very important. The study was undertaken during the year 2018-19 in East Godavari districts of Andhra Pradesh with a sampling of 200 farmers based on number of respondents who had soil health cards. The main objective of the study was to find out the significant relationship between the profile characteristics and the perception of the farmers on SHC recommendations. The data indicated 54% respondents had medium level of perception followed by high level of perception 28.5 % and low level of perception 17.5 %. Further, the study revealed that extension contact of farmers had positive and significant relationship while family type had negative and significant relationship with their perception about soil health card recommendations. It was concluded that majority of respondents had medium level of perception about soil health card recommendations and its use.</p> <p><b>The author(s) are requested to explain why they chose only 200 farmers for the study? For collection of data self developed questionnaire was used? In abstract about relationship nothing is written. Further, correlation table needs more explanation. Conclusion can be modified also in light of the objectives of study and results obtained.</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The author(s) are requested to modify paper as suggested .	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In my opinion the author(s) have done justice to the topic understudy and after minor changes, the paper may be accepted for publication	

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

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bilal Ahmad Bhat</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>