

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_112234
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmers Intention Regarding Adoption of Organic Agriculture
Type of the Article	research 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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> This study is only a superficial description that cannot help the scientific community. No (Understanding farmers' intentions to adopt organic farming in India) The article's abstract is not comprehensive, the research method, number of samples, analysis method, and results are not mentioned. Yes No, the manuscript has major scientific problems. No references are mentioned in the manuscript 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>It is somewhat appropriate</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract is incomplete and lacks an explanation of the research method, sample size, analysis method, and results. The introduction lacks references, the study objectives are unspecified, the statement of the problem in the study area is absent, and the research gap remains unclear. The research method is incomplete as it lacks an explanation of the sample size, the design of the questionnaire, and the validity and reliability of the research tool. Additionally, the data analysis method has not been elucidated. If the planned behavior model was used to measure farmers' intentions (according to the items in Table 1), then why was it not mentioned in the research method? The items designed for measuring farmers' intentions are not proper. The current research lacks a framework to measure farmers' intentions, while different models could be used. The discussion and conclusion sections are written very poorly. 	

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:	Rezvan Ghanbari
Department, University & Country	Lorestan University, Iran