

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_100673
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on Awareness level of the Respondents regarding Crop Insurance in Cooch Behar District of West Bengal.
Type of the Article	Original 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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- The manuscript is about the insurance of agricultural product and the knowledge of farmer about in in India. It has no new message for the scientific community.</p> <p>2- Yes, it is suitable.</p> <p>3- Yes, it is. But, it is not structural.</p> <p>4- Yes.</p> <p>5- Yes, but needs some correction.</p> <p>6- No enough, and some of them are not recent.</p> <p>7- Results and discussion should be two separate sections.</p> <p>8- What is the response variable in regression analysis, and how it was measured.</p> <p>9- When $R^2=0.149$, it means a bad regression model.</p> <p>10- Nothing about variables in Table 5 was mentioned in method section.</p> <p>11- No p-values in table 5.</p> <p>12- No good conclusion (short- No references).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1- Yes it is.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Masoud Roudbari
Department, University & Country	Iran University of Medical Sciences, Iran