

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_94979
Title of the Manuscript:	CONSERVATION AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGY: EXTENT OF ADOPTION & CONSTRAINTS FACED BY FARMERS OF MP
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community since it deals with an important issue of agriculture: adoption of CA, an important set of technologies that help agriculture to become sustainable;</p> <p>2. The title needs to be rewritten. Eg, I don't know what means MP;</p> <p>3. Partially. It has neither the aim of the manuscript, nor the methodology;</p> <p>4. Partially. a) In the introduction there is not the objective, b) Methodology: When the interviews were done? c) The methodology is very empirical. Authors did not cite previous studies which used the same methodology. Is there any specific reason?</p> <p>5. Partially. a) Authors used only descriptive statistics. If think that it would be much correct if they used Logit/probit regression model. This regression is widely used to determine factors affecting adoption of agricultural technologies. Thus, I think this manuscript is not very interesting. b) How were the sample chosen? c) In the subtitle "A] Extent of adoption of CA technology" authors mention table 1, but it appears after two pages. Instead of appear table 1, first it appears figure 1. It is not correct.</p> <p>6. The references are recent but not sufficient. It is important to remind that the author of scientific article should cite more other articles than thesis/dissertation, books, etc. I did not see articles in the references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Although the topic is very interesting. The manuscript needs corrections. As I mentioned in the last section, the article lacks objective, the methodology needs revision, etc	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sergio Feliciano Come
Department, University & Country	Universidade Zambeze, Mozambique