

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_98244
Title of the Manuscript:	Rajasthan's Agricultural Innovation Landscape: An overview of Start-ups and Trends
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 1.7**

**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 REVISION comments</b></p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>1. Yes.</b></p> <p>Thanks for letting me read and review this interesting paper, and after carefully reviewing it, I have some major issues and recommendations that could be improved this paper: This article is well written, and there are major issues that should be corrected. The title reflects the intention and the topic of the article quite well.</p> <p>The abstract is somewhat confusing because it contains some redundancies, and it lacks a clear line of argumentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Problem Statement</li> <li>- Research Question</li> <li>- Placement in Relevant Scientific Fields</li> <li>- Methodology</li> <li>- Key Findings</li> <li>- Contribution.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, I recommend that the abstract should be rewritten. The linkage between the manuscript's objective and why the research was necessary was not well established? Objective and positioning.</p> <p>The Introduction could do more to ground the paper's in the debate and the related literature. In the actual manuscript, scant attention is given to a theoretical derivation of the study and its actual positioning. Indeed, the lack of studies cannot be considered sufficient motivation for this study.</p> <p>My suggestion is also to fully rewrite this section in order to answer the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Why is this topic relevant, and what is known about it?</li> <li>(ii) Which are the gaps you plan to address and how do you problematize them?</li> <li>(iii) How do you plan to close/address those gaps?</li> <li>(iv) Which are the main contributions of your study?</li> </ul> <p>I encourage authors to carefully consider and incorporate the suggested articles for the manuscript quality improvements and justify where necessary.</p> <p>I would also suggest that the authors extend their literature review regarding the field. It is not clear how this paper contributes to the extant literature.</p> <p>I suggest rewriting the introduction part and critically analyzing the literature. The literature review is not thorough as should be, so the reader is not given an adequate background about the topic.</p> <p>Although the literature is not adequately written, it offers no new information and no new slant on the topic.</p> <p>Most of the content in the manuscript is well known by the readers of the journal. Here are some additional recommendations that could improve the paper: The paper is not rich in data as should be, and it should be many method choices can be made concerning that.</p> <p>However, it is difficult to follow and understand your method choices as structured now. I suggest that you start with an overview of the research process have a section for each stage which includes discussion/subsections on your research strategy, data collection techniques, and data analysis.</p> <p>Although, the authors have done a good job in explaining the methodology. I am particularly curious to know why they chose the statistical method. What is the unit of analysis? What sampling methodology you use!</p> <p>The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far.</p> <p>Your storyline in the results section and conclusion is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are far from what one can infer from the empirical results. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature. The conclusions are short and needs to be emphasized and strengthen well. The authors should include only the conclusions that were originated from research and which are relevant for the paper. Conclusions section requires major revision. Also, provide some future research direction in the stock price synchronicity with some study limitations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please think about the significance of the implications of the study. What message do you want to deliver and how will the reader benefit from your paper? So please enhance the conclusions.</li> <li>- The introduction section is not good written, and needs more clarifications and explanations.</li> <li>- The writing style, for example, some paragraphs are just three sentences and others are too long. Please make your writing consistency.</li> <li>- A professional English language proofreader is highly advised before resubmission</li> <li>- Please refer to some relevant literature from the journal and wider literature, such as the below references.</li> </ul> <p>I have noticed some good points, but the literature review needs to be improved, so I suggest including more recent studies about agricultural innovation landscape in Rajasthan. Also, some of the in-text citations needs further improvement. The authors should check the journal template and be assure that all requirements have been considered.</p> <p>Also, the paper should be re-edited to fix its errors in both punctuation and grammar. The manuscript must describe a technically sound piece of scientific research with data that supports the conclusions. Experiments must have been conducted rigorously, with appropriate controls, replication, and sample sizes. The conclusions must be drawn appropriately based on the data presented. Some fresh related studies should be included in this study. There are some section that are not in thier proper section and this should be revisit. The study is not unpinned by any theoretical framework which underplay the validity of the result obtained.</p> <p>Theories on agricultural innovation landscape determination, random walk or technical analysis would have suffice.</p> <p>The discussion session should compare result obtained to existing result and alignment or otherwise with existing theor(ies) . The discussion session can be more robust. The methodology employed need to be detailed and systematically explained.</p> <p>The study will provide a beneficial information to the agricultural innovation landscape in Rajasthan and also policy makers mainly in effect of environmental information on the agricultural innovation landscape in Rajasthan in the study area.</p> <p>However, the following suggestions above should be put into consideration and further action in order to enhance the quality of the paper. Thanks</p> <p>Overall, it is still very weak research paper and I should choose "serious major revision" after carefully reviewing it.</p> <p>I welcome the revision paper in the future.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. <b>Yes.</b></li> <li>3. <b>No.</b></li> <li>4. <b>No.</b></li> <li>5. <b>No.</b></li> <li>6. <b>No.</b></li> </ol> <p>The authors can include several studies which related to the current journal. The references are insufficient and should be fresh. Please see related studies in ScienceDirect and Web of Science. I would highly suggest the authors reviewing as many as possible published articles by the targeted journal, to observe the requirement of the targeted journal before submission.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>No. the English language of the paper needs a proof editing and an expert in English language because the paper has a lot of grammatical issues and many unclear phrases.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nemer Badwan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute, Palestine</b>