

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_104281
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Cluster Front Line Demonstrations on Productivity, Profitability and Yield Gap of Blackgram in Nellore District of Andhra 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.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>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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scientific community is making every effort to provide farmers with new technologies. The purpose, objectives and conclusions of the article are aimed at achieving the set goals 2. Selection of agricultural land for demonstrations, sample size ensure representativeness. 3. The title of the article reflects its content. 4. The abstract reflects the content. 5. The structure of the manuscript and subsections fully reflects the logic of the research, the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. There are enough references to make the analysis convincing 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Blackgram area accounts for about 19 percent of India's total pulse area, accounting for 23 percent of total pulse production. India, which is the largest producer and consumer of black gram in the world, produces 23.4 million tons of black gram per year from 46.7 million hectares of land with an average output of 501 kg/ha.</p> <p>The low productivity of blackgram in Nellore County in the state is caused by a lack of quality seeds or improved varieties, unbalanced fertilizer use, rain-fed cultivation on marginal and sub-marginal lands, and low knowledge of pest and disease control</p> <p>To find out the seed yield, technology gap, expansion gap, technology index and economic parameters, 150 demonstrations were held from 2020 to 2022 in rainfed conditions in the Nellore district of Andhra Pradesh. Each demonstration was carried out on an area of 0.4 hectares. The ICM practice included sowing of an improved variety (GTD 104), seed treatment + application of neem oil at 25-30 DAS + installation of sticky traps to monitor sucking pest vectors + spraying with monocrotophos @ 1.6 ml per liter of water from the flowering stage to the pod stage for insect control + spraying with carbendazim to control leaf spot. The demonstrations were carried out on sandy-clayey loamy soils with low and medium fertility. Yield data for improved practices and farmers' practices were recorded during threshing. It was found that the increase in yield compared to the practice of farmers was 25.1, 33.4 and 22.6.</p> <p>The study was carried out according to the methods used in agricultural research.</p> <p>The results of the demonstrations and the agricultural technologies that followed, according to the author, were accepted by the farmers. who have not previously used these technologies.</p> <p>The authors' conclusions are consistent with the conclusions of well-known scientists.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Victor Stukach
Department, University & Country	Institution of Reviewer Omsk State Agrarian, University Country of Reviewer Position, Russia