

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97275
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF CLUSTER FRONTLINE DEMONSTRATIONS ON YIELD OF CHICKPEA (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) IN PRAKASAM DISTRICT OF ANDHARA PRADESH
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.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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript addresses an extremely interesting and useful topic, namely, the effect of interaction between researchers and farmers on agricultural production (specifically, chickpeas). Focusing on Prakasam District of Andhra Pradesh, it performs a descriptive data analysis to assess how the use of technologies arising from such interaction can increase productivity and crop yield. Its results show the benefits of adopting new technologies.</p> <p>2. Yes, I agree with the title.</p> <p>3. Yes, I agree with the summary in its current form.</p> <p>4. Yes, the sections are well organized, helping to tell the story of the main findings in a logical and objective way.</p> <p>5. Yes, I agree with the methodology used by the authors.</p> <p>6. Yes, I am satisfied with the included references. There is no need to add new references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are some small issues that deserve to be appreciated by the authors:</p> <p>(1) Authors use both "FRONTLINE" and "FRONT LINE";</p> <p>(2) Please, review the sentence "Based on the information collected, production of chickpea is decreasing day by day because farmers not adopting the improved production technologies." (Fourth page, first paragraph)</p> <p>(3) Please, review the sentence "It is evident from Table.1 that indicated that the cluster front linedemonstration has given a good impact over the farming community of Prakasam district as they were motivated by the new agricultural technologies applied</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	in the demonstrations." (The beginning of the Section 'RESULTS AND DISCUSSION')	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wilson Calmon Almeida dos Santos
Department, University & Country	Institute of Mathematics and Statistics, Fluminense Federal University, Brazil