

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAEES_106435</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Farmer's behavior towards adoption of Eco-Friendly Natural Farming System in Mandi District of Himachal Pradesh, India</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. It can be important or not hard to determine this manuscript's place in the scientific community; but the models still need big modification and have been simply set without any comparison to other models; results have also been not compared to other findings.</p> <p>2. It requires high modification to be a suitable article with what has been indicated in the abstract and the models.</p> <p>3. It is not justified how that districted was selected over the other districts; and the number of samples is not indicated. Also, the economic advantage of natural farming over conventional one is only assumed, and not clearly shown.</p> <p>4. The Subsections of the manuscript are not appropriate.</p> <p>5. yes; but the way the Cobb Douglas functions has been used looks inappropriate; logit model coefficient has been interpreted in a linear way which is wrong. So, both of them must reinterpreted to more sound.</p> <p>6. Remove the colour in the reference and it does not have been date problems</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>yes. It has been written in a good English, but revisit it and write it in simple way to be suitable for scholarly communication throughout the world.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The paper is composed of vague everywhere &amp; model selection (Cobb Douglas &amp; logit) is not justified.</li> <li>✓ Independent variables in the Cobb Douglas regression have not been shown interpreted in the result section. Therefore, do this one</li> <li>✓ Also, in both models, the researcher does not justify why they used those independent variables or variable selection was not supported by literature &amp; whether those variables sufficient for the study.</li> <li>✓ The abstract must follow the correct structure or include all element of an abstract &amp; the researcher's objective as well.</li> </ul> <p>Further, the two major problems of the manuscript are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the conclusion it reads "with proper government support the widespread adoption of natural farming is feasible in the long run" this shows that the researcher does not have clue of how finding can be scaled up &amp; external validity.</li> <li>2. As I stated above, the researcher must interpret the coefficient of the logit model in the correct ways.</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Haileslasie Gereziher Hailu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mekelle University, Ethiopia</b>