

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Experimental Agriculture International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JEAI_117071 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | CONSTRUCTION OF SCALE ON PERCEPTION OF FARMERS TOWARDS E-CROP BOOKING |
| 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://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>The authors report on developing a means of measuring farmers attitudes and then claim that it demonstrates favourable attitudes toward the government.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, needs a Limitations sub-section under Conclusions.</p> <p>No, the authors did not report how they controlled for alpha-retrograde. They had at minium 40 tests of significance, and at least 2 could be significant by chance alone at the <.05 level.</p> <p>The Introduction has substantial declaratory and factual statements w/o reference or citation: Intro, par 1 sen 1&2; par 2 sens 1-6 and 8&9. They did not mention what the sample N size was and there was no mention of statistical power, or whether this was an exploratory pilot study. Also, the manuscript is in serious need of English copy-editing and I am recommending a outside English copy-editing service that specializes in technical and scientific reports. The manuscript was real short on Methods, with the exception of survey construction methods. Also, statistically, multiple t-tests are not good discriminators and an ANOVA should be considered provided sufficient statistical power unless the study is an exploratory pilot.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | No, please see previous. | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</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> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| Name: | Ralph J Johnson |
| Department, University & Country | UT-MDACC, USA |