

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJAEES_101938 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Farmers' Purchasing Behaviour of Insecticides in Cumin and Problems Faced by Farmers for Cumin in Dhrol Taluka of Jamnagar District, Gujarat |
| 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> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community?: The manuscript appears to be important for the scientific community, particularly those involved in agriculture and agrochemicals. It provides insights into the socio-economic profile of farmers, factors affecting purchasing behavior towards insecticides, and the problems faced by farmers and dealers. It also identifies promotional activities used by agri-input companies. This information could be valuable for stakeholders in the agrochemical industry and for researchers studying agricultural practices and trends. 2. Is the title of the article suitable?: Based on the title "Farmers' Purchasing Behaviour of Insecticides in Cumin and Problems Faced by Farmers for Cumin in Dhrol Taluka of Jamnagar District, Gujarat", it seems to be quite descriptive and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. It clearly states the focus of the study (farmers' purchasing behavior of insecticides in cumin and problems faced by farmers), as well as the geographical context (Dhrol Taluka of Jamnagar District, Gujarat). However, the title is a bit long and could potentially be streamlined for clarity and conciseness. An alternative could be "Insecticide Purchasing Behaviour and Challenges in Cumin Farming: A Study in Dhrol Taluka, Gujarat". This alternative title maintains the key elements of the original title but is slightly shorter and more direct. 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?: The abstract seems to provide a comprehensive overview of the study, including its objectives, methodology, and key findings. It covers the socio-economic profile of farmers, the factors affecting their purchasing behavior towards insecticides, and the problems they face. It also discusses the issues faced by agri-input dealers and the promotional activities used by agri-input companies. 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?: Given the information available and your comments, it seems that the manuscript could benefit from a more structured layout. Dividing the introduction into two sections: "Introduction" and "Literature Review" could provide a clearer overview of the background and previous research on the topic. Additionally, separating "Data Analysis" and "Results" into distinct sections could help to clarify the findings of the study and make it easier for readers to follow the progression of the research. This structure would align with common conventions in academic writing, which typically include separate sections for the introduction, literature review, methodology, data analysis, results, and conclusion. 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?: Based on the methodology section of the manuscript, it appears that the authors have followed a rigorous scientific approach. They have clearly outlined their research design, including the type of research, sampling method and technique, sample unit and size, research instrument, and analytical tools. They have also described their data collection process, which includes both primary and secondary data. The use of various analytical tools, including tabular analysis, Garrett's Ranking Technique, Pearson Chi-square test, and Weighted Average Mean, also adds to the scientific rigor of the study. However, in terms of structure, as mentioned earlier, the manuscript could benefit from a more clear separation of sections. For instance, the "Materials and Methods" section could be further divided into "Data Collection" and "Data Analysis" subsections for clarity. Similarly, the "Results" section could be separated from the "Discussion" section to clearly distinguish between the findings of the study and their interpretation or implications. Overall, the manuscript appears to be scientifically sound based on the information available. 6. Are the references sufficient and recent?: Based on the extracted references, it appears that the authors have used a variety of sources, including government databases, journals, articles, and websites. Some of the references are from 2023, indicating that the authors have used recent sources. However, the authors could consider adding more academic references to strengthen their arguments and provide a more comprehensive literature review. For example, they could include more studies on farmers' purchasing behavior, the use of insecticides in agriculture, and the challenges faced by farmers and dealers in the agrochemical industry. Additionally, the authors could consider citing more sources that provide a broader context or | |

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>theoretical framework for their study. For example, they could cite studies on the socio- economic factors influencing farmers' decisions, the impact of agrochemical use on the environment and human health, and the role of government policies and regulations in the agrochemical industry.</p> <p>7. Based on the full manuscript, here are some additional suggestions/comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The authors have done a good job of presenting their findings in a clear and organized manner. However, they could consider providing more interpretation and discussion of their results. For example, they could discuss the implications of their findings for farmers, dealers, and policymakers in the agrochemical industry. They could also discuss how their findings contribute to the existing literature on farmers' purchasing behavior and the use of insecticides in agriculture. • The authors could consider including a limitations section in their manuscript. This would involve acknowledging any limitations in their study and discussing how these limitations might affect the interpretation of their results. This could enhance the transparency and credibility of their research. • The authors could also consider providing more context for their study. For example, they could discuss the importance of cumin farming in the Dhrol Taluka of Jamnagar District, Gujarat, and the role of insecticides in this type of farming. They could also discuss the broader socio- economic and environmental implications of insecticide use in agriculture. • In the conclusion section, the authors could consider providing more specific recommendations based on their findings. For example, they could suggest strategies for improving farmers' access to credit, reducing the cost of insecticides, and enhancing the effectiveness of promotional activities. They could also suggest areas for future research based on the gaps and questions identified in their study. • The manuscript could benefit from a thorough proofreading to correct minor grammatical errors and improve the clarity of the writing. For example, the phrase "as age of the farmers increase income also increase" could be rephrased as "as the age of the farmers increases, their income also increases". • The authors could consider including more visual aids, such as graphs and charts, to illustrate their findings. This could make the data more accessible and engaging for readers. • Finally, the authors could consider including a section on the practical implications of their research. This could involve discussing how their findings could be used by farmers, dealers, policymakers, and other stakeholders in the agrochemical industry. For example, they could discuss how understanding farmers' purchasing behavior and the challenges they face could inform the development of policies and practices to support sustainable agriculture and rural development. • | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

PART 2:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>Reviewer's comment</p> | <p>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> |
| <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> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Ikram Hasan |
| Department, University & Country | Universiti Tun Abdul Razak, Malaysia |