

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_119661
Title of the Manuscript:	Impacts assessment of farmers' knowledge in using pesticides on agricultural productivity in Bugesera District, Rwanda
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.journalajraf.com/index.php/AJRAF/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes. The information gathered in the manuscript is very useful to the present-day situation.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There is a vast scope to improve the language/ English quality of the article. The language/ English quality has less impressed me.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There should have a space between the words (highlighted with yellow mark). 2. Citation numbers like [1], [2] etc. should be superscript just after the last word of the sentence. 3. What is FAW? Write its full form. (Highlighted with yellow mark). 4. Write the full form of GAP (Highlighted with yellow mark). 5. The data given from Republic of Rwanda Statistical Yearbook 2014 is too old. If possible, update the manuscript with recent data. 6. In 2.1. The study area is gathering with some irrelevant information in the last part. It can be deleted. 7. In 2.2. Data collection, the red marked part is found not necessary. 8. In 2.2. Data collection, the citation mark should be given for the 'The Yamane formula'. 9. The table number and its title should be given at the top of the table. 10. In 3.1. Characteristics of farmers, mention the reference table number and read the red marked portion for its improvement. 11. There is no need of a dot (.) at table .1. If possible, start the word 'table' with capital 'T' 12. In the first part of 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION, it becomes confusing to read specially the 3.1 and 3.2. 13. In 3.2. Farmers' knowledge and experience in using pesticides, read the red marked part and improve it. 14. Need not to write table number repeatedly in 3.2. 15. Put citation number for National institute of statistics in Rwanda, MINAGRI report of 2019 16. Write full form of all abbreviations at the first so that it does not make the readers confuse. 17. Correct the table numbers in the write up/ manuscript. 18. What does early evening means? Even not in Table 4. 19. In 3.3, the write up setting is very poor. It makes readers difficult to read. Make proper column setting. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>20. The conclusion is not written in proper way. It should contain general comments, some valuable suggestions to the farmers for improvement of farm production, some policy making process etc. The authors wrote the results of the study except the last paragraph. So, re-writing of conclusion is needed.</p> <p>21. Read the whole manuscript very carefully so that the minimum standard of the writings can be maintained. The grammatical mistakes, sentence framing, proper column setting of the write up etc. should be proper. Few examples are highlighted (yellow and red mark) in the manuscript.</p> <p>22. In the references, et al. is not applicable. There should have the name of all authors. The style of writing all the references should be same. Check the writing style.</p>	
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

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:	Ghana Kanta Sarma
Department, University & Country	Assam Agricultural University, India