

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_105646
Title of the Manuscript:	Association of socio-economic profile of farmers with perception towards soil health card in Surajpur District (C.G.)
Type of the Article	

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes. However, it needs the improvisation.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Language Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The abstract mentions "precipitation level" without specifying the type of precipitation. Clarify the term for better understanding. - The language throughout the abstract needs' refinement for clarity and coherence. - Introduction Enhancement**: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly articulate the study's purpose and what sets it apart from existing research. - Incorporate references to relevant literature to establish the context and significance of the study. - Benefits of the Study: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduce a section explaining why this study is valuable. Highlight the potential contributions to the field, the agricultural community, or policy implications. - References and Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The introduction and discussion sections lack sufficient references and evidence to support the claims made. Strengthen your arguments with credible sources and previous research findings. - Results Presentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The results section should go beyond simply describing values in tables. Provide explanations for the observed results, discussing potential reasons behind each outcome. - Discussion Elaboration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The discussion section should provide a deeper analysis of the results, relating them to the existing literature and theoretical frameworks. Elaborate on why certain socio-economic factors might influence perception levels. - Conclusion Clarification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The conclusion should not just summarize the study; it should reiterate the main findings, and their implications, and suggest avenues for further research or practical applications. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Lack of Explanation and Discussion:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- There is a noticeable lack of detailed explanation and discussion of the results. Readers need a clear understanding of the mechanisms and context behind the observed relationships. - Overall Readiness for Publishing:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Based on the current state, the manuscript is not ready for publishing and requires significant improvement in terms of language, content, and structure. - This feedback highlights key areas that need attention and improvement in the manuscript, providing the authors with a roadmap to enhance the quality of their work before submission for publication. <p>7. Additional comments are in the manuscript file.</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Need a massive improvisation.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Language Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The abstract mentions "precipitation level" without specifying the type of precipitation. Clarify the term for better understanding. - The language throughout the abstract needs refinement for clarity and coherence. - Introduction Enhancement**: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly articulate the study's purpose and what sets it apart from existing research. - Incorporate references to relevant literature to establish the context and significance of the study. - Benefits of the Study: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduce a section explaining why this study is valuable. Highlight the potential contributions to the field, the agricultural community, or policy implications. - References and Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The introduction and discussion sections lack sufficient references and evidence to support the claims made. Strengthen your arguments with credible sources and previous research findings. - Results Presentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The results section should go beyond simply describing values in tables. Provide explanations for the observed results, discussing potential reasons behind each outcome. - -Discussion Elaboration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The discussion section should provide a deeper analysis of the results, relating them to the existing literature and theoretical frameworks. Elaborate on why certain socio-economic factors might influence perception levels. - Conclusion Clarification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The conclusion should not just summarize the study; it should reiterate the main findings, and their implications, and suggest avenues for further research or practical applications. - Lack of Explanation and Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a noticeable lack of detailed explanation and discussion of the results. Readers need a clear understanding of the mechanisms and context behind the observed relationships. - Overall Readiness for Publishing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based on the current state, the manuscript is not ready for publishing and requires significant improvement in terms of language, content, and structure. - This feedback highlights key areas that need attention and improvement in the manuscript, providing the authors with a roadmap to enhance the quality of their work before submission for publication. <p>Additional comments are in the manuscript file.</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:	Manas Sarkar
Department, University & Country	University of California, USA