

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_98441
Title of the Manuscript:	Construction of Knowledge Test to Measure the Knowledge of KVK beneficiary farmers on farming practices
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Abstract:</p> <p>-It is unclear what the main findings are in the abstract. Authors could make the main findings clear in 2-3 sentences as the abstract is a summary of the whole work which must coax readers.</p> <p>-Again, authors are advised to add the significance or theoretical/application value of findings to the abstract, particularly, as a concluding sentence (s). Line 5: Kindly state the full meaning of KVK, before using the abbreviated format in the abstract.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>-Authors are advised to briefly integrate, add or give a background to the key concept and theories anchoring the current study.</p> <p>-Authors must integrate the research progress; thus, what's known about the topic from a global perspective and what's unknown but important to be studied that is currently driving the study objectives.</p> <p>-The last paragraph must highlight the main objective (s) clearly, contribution of the study to theory/application, policy-makers, research community, industrial players, farmers and so on clearly.</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <p>-What expression or theory was used at arriving or can be used to substantiate this sample size? -How justifiable is the said number in drawing logical or general conclusions for this study? -how did authors deal with bias or partial judgements from the experts or respondents? -Did authors consider gender bias? -Kindly number all the equations given in the study</p> <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <p>-Authors failed to thoroughly explain results generated. Again, correlation and other analysis conducted were not explained. The current presentation or status for this section is unacceptable and inappropriate.</p> <p>-Authors need to compare the study findings to other studies with similar scope or existing literature in order for readers to appreciate and understand findings.</p> <p>-The discussion section could be separated from the results section.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>-Authors need to include a concluding section.</p> <p>-Must summarize the main aim, key findings, study limitations, gaps and opportunities that could drive future studies and finally, highlight briefly the importance or contribution of study findings to key players.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Other comments: -Some minor to moderate grammatical defects and syntax errors were identified throughout the manuscript; few were revised or corrected. Though the paper is generally well-written, the authors need to revised or correct this minor to moderate defects to enhance the overall proficiency level of the paper.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Isaac Sarfo
Department, University & Country	Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, China