

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARJA_114062</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Scale Construction to Measure the Attitude of Farmers towards Agricultural Diversification</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript is important to the scientific community. It explores the attitudes of farmers towards change and diversification in agricultural practices. Their attitudes would determine whether or not new practices would yield positive results. Through diversification processes including procedures that result in GMOs could be better explored and food insecurity would be directly addressed and tackled.</li> <li>2. The current title of the article is: "Scale Construction to Measure the Attitude of Farmers towards Agricultural Diversification". The title gives a clear understanding of what the manuscript aims to explore, communicate and resolve. However, the wording could be more professional e.g. " A Scale Construction Measuring the Attitudes of Farmers Towards Agricultural Diversification, India, 2023-2024".</li> <li>3. The abstract is comprehensive and gives a brief and well summarised review of the manuscript and its contents. There's a balance between the introduction, methodology, discussion and conclusion. It gives greater attention to the results which is the most important section of a research paper.</li> <li>4. The subsections of the manuscript need to be reviewed. More specifically; there are sections that are bold without a clear reason. Furthermore, the results and discussion section should have begun from the first mention of the researchers personally obtained results. The current 'Results and discussion' section is too short due to the researcher not beginning the section from the appropriate place i.e. From 'Relevancy test' to 'Reliability of the Scale' those figures should be included in the 'Results and discussion' section.</li> <li>5. Based on the chosen methodology, the subject matter of the research as well as the formulas and calculations used in the manuscript are scientifically correct.</li> <li>6. Most of the manuscripts' references are from the early 1930s to the 1950s and from the early 2000s to 2014. Their Impact Factors are not strong enough to validate the manuscript without the presence of its results or with the aim to compare results. It is suggested to the researchers that they find publications from the mid 2000s until now that have higher Impact Factors and relevancy.</li> </ol>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The manuscript has a major issue in terms of grammar. Beginning from the abstract many of the sentences lack the basic parts of speech, specifically conjunctions and verbs. Examples from the manuscript are provided below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Therefore, present study has been conducted to develop a reliable and valid instrument to measure... x should be &gt;&gt;&gt; Therefore, the present study has been conducted in order to develop a valid and reliable instrument that would be used to measure....</li> <li>2. The reliability was checked using split half method and validity was examined with the help of...x should be &gt;&gt;&gt; The reliability was checked using a split half method and the validity was examined with the help of....</li> <li>3. To measure this, researcher has developed and standardized the attitude scale...x should be &gt;&gt;&gt; To measure this the researcher has developed and standardised an attitude scale...</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	A clear revision will ensure that the publication is suitable for scholarly communications without questions of grammar being brought up.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is scientifically relevant and the topic is of great importance, not only to the scientific community but to the general population as well. I look forward to reading the manuscript in its completed state. Well done on taking the initiative to pursue this research and seeing it through.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Fahimah Nambwaayo Ssemanda</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of the People, South Africa</b>