

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_95903
Title of the Manuscript:	Link Between the Socio-economic Profile of Farmers in North Eastern Haryana and the Over-exploitation of Irrigation Resources
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>)

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Title:</p> <p>-The title must read as "Link Between the Socio-economic Profile of Farmers in North Eastern Haryana and the Over-exploitation of Irrigation Resources"</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>-Lines 13-15: No need to state the variables, it is advisable to state the data analysis technique/approach used briefly in just a sentence.</p> <p>-I humbly suggest the authors break Lines 16-24 into 3-4 sentences using full stops or the correct punctuation. Currently, how the results are presented/summarized in the abstract is lengthy and vague. Readers or the audience must at least swallow something.</p> <p>-Kindly add a concluding part which states the relevance or significance of findings to sector players as a concluding sentence or make a recommendation based on study findings in the abstract.</p> <p>Materials and methods:</p> <p>-How representative is this sample size in drawing general conclusions for the study?</p> <p>-Did authors consider bias judgements, if so, how did they deal with it as a means of not influencing the validity/reliability of study findings?</p> <p>These parameters must be justified briefly considering the subjective nature of the approach used.</p> <p>-Line 85: The specific version of SPSS software used must be stated.</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>For clarity and consistency, the discussion section must be separated from the results section.</p> <p>-The results must be presented in orderly manner based on the study objectives, without any further discussion or explanation.</p> <p>-All detailed explanations must be done appropriately in the discussion section.</p> <p>Table 1 must be moved up and placed immediately after introducing the results section briefly.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>-Kindly re-organize or move the discussion aspect here.</p> <p>-They must be placed in subsections or paragraphs. Each paragraph must present a particular idea linked to the study objective and results in an orderly manner.</p> <p>-Each finding must be compared to existing literature or other studies in similar scope conducted elsewhere.</p> <p>-Authors can consider establishing a correlation or link between some variables like age, education and experience of the farmers to the overexploitation of resources. Does elite or highly educated/knowledgeable/trained farmers engage in such acts as compared to those without high education/training?...same could be done for experience and so on. Such links could be considered to enrich the first part of the discussion section.</p> <p>-Please integrate more literature to enrich, compare and substantiate findings.</p> <p>-Kindly organize the sections appropriately for easy read by readers without ambiguity or confusion.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Conclusion:</p> <p>-No need to re-paste findings this way. The key findings of this study must be summarized and not repeated verbatim or directly as done here.</p> <p>-Kindly remove the statistics in brackets and present the key findings clearly or in a concise manner.</p> <p>-What were some of the limitations or opportunities or gaps in this study that could drive future research? These must be integrated briefly in the conclusion.</p> <p>-What are some of the significance of study findings to sectoral players and the international research community or decision-makers? Please integrate that briefly in the conclusion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>References:</p> <p>-Some of the references are incomplete or incorrect. Kindly check and add the details like: titles, publisher, volume (issue), and page numbers where necessary for articles and other information.</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <p>-Moderate to major grammatical defects and syntax errors were identified throughout the manuscript. Few were corrected. I humbly suggest the authors thoroughly check and correct them prior to re-submission.</p> <p>***Kindly refer to the manuscript for other comments and revisions in track changes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>***The manuscript is generally informative and has the ingredients to impact policy. However, there are some critical issues of concern that the authors need to consider and re-organize or restructure to improve the overall nature of the manuscript.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

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