

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_117030
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmers perceptions towards NAIS and WBCIS insurance schemes in southern Rajasthan
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. Yes, the manuscript was very important for the scientific community in order to identify the existing problems or bottlenecks due to agricultural failures because of the effects of climate change. If the manuscript well-articulated its essentials for all stakeholder not only for farmers. 2. No. The title of the manuscript somewhat confusing, it's not easily understandable for all. The title should not abbreviated, it's not understandable for all readers. So in order to readable for all reader it should be mentioned what does it mean NAIS and WBCIS? As an alternatives; the title of the article should also modified as "Farmers perceptions towards Agricultural insurance schemes in southern Rajasthan": the case of National Agricultural Insurance Scheme (NAIS) and Weather based crop insurance scheme (WBCIS). 3. No. The abstract should express the whole content of the manuscript. It should include introduction/statement of the problems, objectives, methodology, results and discussion, conclusions and finally recommendations depends on your findings. So arrange it accordingly. 4. No. Subsections and structure of the manuscript not appropriate. The authors missed some essential subsections and structure such as objectives of the manuscript, under methodology part, conclusion and recommendations. Even under results and discussion not clearly indicated the statements of the problem. 5. No. it needs revision, the contents are important but not well articulated as scientific 6. No. the references are not sufficient and recent. The references was too small, it's difficult to mention the whole document by only three citations. You should include the recent and most significant citations and add more references. You should give the credit for the previous studies, means that should be acknowledge and cited in your whole document. How can you support your results without comparing the previous studies? <p>*****Additional comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Citations are very important, please review some additional previous studies. You should strengthen your literature review -Mention the reason why you choose only those two schemes among the others? -Please indicate your objectives. The objectives of the article should be clearly indicated. What are those your objectives? Is it one or two?. Do you compare the two schemes???. What about the perceptions and attitudes of farmers on the schemes? -You should classify the subsections of the research methodology. (Study area, methods of data collection, and methods of sampling, methods of data analysis). -What about the farmers' perceptions on the schemes under results and discussion part? It's missed? Should be indicated/included _Table 2. The comparison is not clear, which column is for NAIS and WBCIS, please identify them. Even under each site you selected. You should compare the two schemes accordingly to your site (under both sites). -The important components were missed. Where is your conclusions as well as recommendations????????????? You should include it. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments	No. it needs to check more grammatically. Also spellings should be checked	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Generally the manuscript needs revision including whole parts starting from the title (not abbreviated), abstract (include all components), introduction (literature review and citations), methodology (separate subsections as study area, methods of data collection and analysis, and sampling), results and discussion (missed or unanswered parts, not clearly indicated and discussed), conclusions and recommendations should be included in order to make it scientific. Moreover, the reference is not enough and sufficient,	

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:	Ibsa Dawid Mume
Department, University & Country	Oromia Agricultural Research Institute, Asella Agricultural Engineering Research Center, Ethiopia