

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_112526
Title of the Manuscript:	Cultivating Solutions: Farmer-Driven Constraints and Suggestions for Kisan Call Centre Advisories
Type of the Article	

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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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"> 1. Significant Theme - The study addresses a relevant issue related to communication between farmers and agriculture experts, exploring the perceived limitations by KCC users. 2. The title of the manuscript "Cultivating Solutions: Farmer-Driven Constraints and Suggestions for Kisan Call Centre Advisories" appears to be academically suitable and well-formulated. Here are some points contributing to the academic strength of the title. 3. The abstract provides a clear and concise overview of the study, addressing key elements of the manuscript. 4. Clear Objective: The manuscript seems to have a clear objective of assessing constraints and suggesting improvements for the KCC, aiming to enhance the effectiveness of the service in disseminating agricultural information. 5. Appropriate Methodology: The use of an ex-post facto research design and a mixed-method approach, including quantitative data (Tables and Figures) and qualitative data (farmers' suggestions), suggests a comprehensive approach. 6. Connection to Existing Literature: The manuscript refers to previous studies, showing a connection to existing literature, especially by mentioning similar findings in previous research. 7. Contribution to Knowledge: The study seems to contribute to existing knowledge by highlighting key limitations perceived by farmers and providing specific suggestions to improve the KCC. 8. Applicability in Practice: The suggestions presented in the study are intended to be practical, aiming to enhance the effectiveness of the KCC in providing services to farmers. 9. Practical Relevance: The study highlights practical issues faced by farmers, such as call diversions, language problems, and suggests ways to improve the efficiency of the KCC. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English manuscript appears to be appropriately drafted for scientific terms. It follows a common research structure, starting with an abstract that highlights the study's purpose, methodology, results, and conclusions. Additionally, the introduction, methodology, results, and discussion sections are clearly outlined.</p> <p>The language used seems technical and specific to the agricultural and research context.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In summary, based on the preliminary analysis, the manuscript appears to be academically relevant, addressing a practical issue and providing specific contributions to improving the</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	effectiveness of the Kisan Call Centre in India. Based on the provided manuscript, it appears to be an academic study focused on evaluating the Kisan Call Centre (KCC) in India, with a focus on farmers' perceptions, perceived constraints, and suggestions for improvement. Here are some analyses regarding the academic relevance of the manuscript:	
--	---	--

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:	Luciana Da Silva Barros
Department, University & Country	Escola Agrotécnica da UFRR, Brazil