

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127056
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of a knowledge assessment tool to Measure Farmers' Understanding of Improved Groundnut Cultivation Practices in Telangana
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article providing a “knowledge assessment tool to Measure Farmers' Understanding of Improved Groundnut Cultivation Practices in Telangana” and the method of development which is also known as scale.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes author also can use word Scale instead of Tool	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes Mention method used for developing the tool	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Methodology: 1) Write the review for the criteria to prepare knowledge test 2) Write the review of using split half method for reliability of the test	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	mention the reference of as per the above suggestion	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language in the article reads more like a collection of reviews. The author should adopt a more scholarly tone, presenting the information with deeper analysis and critical insight rather than merely summarizing existing studies.	
Optional/General comments	The author should incorporate additional data-based reviews.	

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:	G. K. Bhabhor
Department, University & Country	Anand Agricultural University, India