

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAAR_105078</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of agricultural technology adoption on farm income of commercial vegetable growers in Bagamati province of Nepal</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript important for scientific community and the <b>title of the article is suitable but might be reframed. Suggestion: <i>Effect of adopting agricultural technology on farm income of commercial vegetable growers in Bagamati province of Nepal</i></b></p> <p>The abstract of the article has lapses at the level of the aims and also at the level of the results just like the article itself.</p> <p><b>Some subsections are poorly framed, example: 3.2.1 <b>Number of adopters</b>. Do you mean the magnitude of <i>agricultural technology's adoption</i>? and the structure of the manuscript is not very appropriate as there is complete absence of "literature review" yet results are discussed making reference to related literature (e.g Wu [11], Pasa [2], KC et al [6], Fadipe et al [21], Adhikari et al [5].....)</b></p> <p><b>The manuscript will be scientifically correct only after effectuating the corrections</b> The references are recent but intext citation needs to be revisited. For instance, What does KC represent in KC et al [6]? And so on</p> <p><b>Model specification is not clear and the variables are not domesticated. Use of Y, X is out of place.</b></p> <p><b>You have to identify the target independent variable which is <i>agricultural technology's adoption</i> (Plastic tunnel, Drip irrigation , Improved varieties, Electric water pump, Sprayer....) and differentiate them from controlled variables such as Farm size (ha), Distance to nearest road, Years of farming</b></p> <p><b>The measurability of the independent variable "<i>agricultural technology adoption</i>" using <i>number of adopters</i> is very challenging. Has any author ever use this measure (we could have verified in the empirical literature which is absent)</b></p> <p><b>You could better use the variable as a dummy to make a comparative study on the case before the adoption of the technology (0) and case after the adoption (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The introduction lacks statement of the problem justify the need for this work (gap to fill) as suppose</li> <li>• Add theoretical and empirical literature review section</li> <li>• Reduce the number of controlled variables so as to increase the R<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Expatiate more on the main variables</li> <li>• Re-specify your model</li> <li>• Precise the type of regression you have used (LOGITISTIC, PROBIT Or LINEAR...)</li> <li>• Where is pseudo R<sup>2</sup> coming from</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>Suitable but needs to be stepped up</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>-</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Achamoh Victalice Ngimanang</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Bamenda, Cameroon</b>