

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_105389
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative economic analysis of adopters and non-adopters of seed-to-seed mechanization in maize in Jangaon district of Telangana
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://journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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> <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>Yes</p> <p>I suggest that it should be a case study. Comparative economic analysis of adopters and non-adopters of seed-to-seed mechanization in maize a case study of Jangaon district in Telangana</p> <p>Somehow</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>References not sufficient. For example in the introduction section there are numerous statements with numerical data but no reference cited to back up</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Inconsistency in section numbering for example, section 2.1.1 Farm income measures has been numbered whereas other sections have not been numbered.</p> <p>2. The author is talking about the technology which was developed by scientists from the Maize Research Station, PJTSAU, Hyderabad. I would suggest she/he includes a section which describes about that technology including picture of the technology.</p> <p>3. The methodology section should be presented as materials and methods, the author should also explain materials used during data collection and data analysis.</p> <p>4. The term 'cost concept' in the results and discussion section should be deleted and instead should only appear in the materials and method section.</p> <p>5. Results and discussion section is not well explained, for example when the author compare the results from previous studies he/ she does not extract or present values of interest from the previous studies.</p> <p>6. The conclusion section is too general. The author didn't present any key numerical findings to support conclusion.</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)
<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:	Evordius Laurent Rulazi
Department, University & Country	Nelson Mandela African Institution of Science and Engineering, Tanzania