

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_112450
Title of the Manuscript:	Augmentation of Livelihood Security of Scheduled Caste farmers in Hassan district of Southern Karnataka
Type of the Article	

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 the 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, but minimum. While it presents a great example of a project that we can use to improve farmers' livelihood security, the framework of the study is not clear so that it is difficult to validate the mentioned findings. Also, as the project was completed by 2019 and now it is 2024, the results could be outdated.</p> <p>I would suggest "Improvement in Livelihood Security of Farmers through Integrated Farming Systems; case study in Hassan District of Southern Karnataka"</p> <p>No. The abstract states many comprehensive findings, but the context of the study, its significance, and the methodology are not adequately justified or mentioned in the abstract. Most of the sentences in the abstract need to be rearranged or corrected with language improvements and with a flow that the reader can clearly understand.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. Major improvements are required in all the parts. Especially in the abstract.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are many findings included in the manuscript which are valuable. However, the actual project was completed by 2019 and this article doesn't mention when the study was conducted. If the study was conducted in recent times there is no validity in the data as many changing circumstances might have affected the current context. The study framework is not clear and major definitions and justifications have not been mentioned (the use of variables, scales, units). In brief, the findings are comprehensive but not scientifically done/written.</p>	

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:	H. M. Shalika Dushani Siriwardhane
Department, University & Country	International College of Business and Technology, Sri Lanka