

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_97566
Title of the Manuscript:	Supply responses to acreage of major oilseed crops in Rajasthan
Type of the 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>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The main aim or primary objective of the study must be stated after the introductory sentence. The current abstract doesn't highlight the main objective despite highlighting the methodology or approach used. -Again, the main findings/standpoints need to be highlighted or summarized in 2-3 sentences. -The abstract should have a concluding sentence that presents the importance of study findings or make a recommendation. Entirely, the word count for the abstract should be kept between 150-250 words. <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Authors can integrate or add some ecosystem based /agricultural/sustainable development theories to enrich the introduction. -The last paragraph of the introduction must clearly highlight what this study attempted to achieve and its relevance or justification. <p>Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Kindly use Math Function or insert equation tabs to insert all equations and variables given in this manuscript. <p>Coefficient of Determinant (R²): Authors are advised to briefly integrate interpretation scale or ranges for R² to help readers understand the degree of variations within the given variables. Example: $0.8 \leq R^2 \leq 1$...to connote robust/strong evidence $0.5 \leq R^2 \leq 0.8$...moderate evidence $0.2 \dots\dots\dots 0.4$...weak Less than 0.2 ...very weak or negligible</p> <p>Kindly refer to this study by Sarfo et al. (2023) for such interpretation guide: -Sarfo, I., Bi, S., Kwang, C. et al. (2023). Class dynamics and relationship between land-use systems and surface temperature in south-eastern Ghana. <i>Environ Earth Sci</i> 82, 104 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-023-10755-z</p> <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The results of this study were not adequately explained or discussed. Authors need to compare the results obtained to other studies conducted elsewhere in similar scope. Does the current study agree or disagree/refute against the findings of other existing studies? -The results of the R2 for the given parameters needs to be vividly explained also. -Again, external factors linked to policies or other factors could be integrated to better understand 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>some determinants/study results.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>-The conclusion is too brief. The main results need to be summarized tentatively.</p> <p>-What were some of the study gaps/limitations of this study that could drive future studies?</p> <p>-What is the significance of study findings to sectoral players and the research community?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Other comments:</p> <p>-The proficiency level of the paper is generally good. Minor to moderate defects and syntax errors were identified. Authors should consider checking the manuscript thoroughly after revision to improve the overall proficiency level of the paper.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is informative and has the needed ingredients to inform policy. However, there are some issues that ought to be addressed to improve the overall robustness 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

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