Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_117131**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EVALUATION OF SOIL HEALTH CARD SCHEME ON PRODUCTIVITY & INCOME GENERATION OF WHEAT IN KYMORE PLATEAU REGION**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments 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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**Title: Peer Review of "Evaluation of Soil Health Card Scheme on Productivity & Income Generation of Wheat in Kymore Plateau Region"** **Introduction** This peer review examines the research article evaluating the impact of the Soil Health Card (SHC) Scheme on wheat productivity and income generation in the Jabalpur district of Madhya Pradesh, India. The original article aims to analyze the influence of SHC adoption on fertilizer consumption patterns and overall farmer income through the use of soil health data for informed agricultural practices. This review critically assesses the study's methodology, findings, presented limitations, and provides a structured way forward. The article centers on the SHC Scheme, initiated by the Government of India to improve agricultural productivity through scientifically informed fertilizer applications. This is significant as it addresses the pressing need for sustainable agricultural practices in a major wheat-producing region. By analyzing the direct impacts of the SHC Scheme, the study targets crucial aspects of agricultural economics and soil science, making it highly relevant for policy makers, agricultural scientists, and farmers. **2. Methodology** The study utilized a combination of random sampling and surveys to collect data from SHC holders across three blocks in Jabalpur. The methodology is robust, involving quantitative analysis techniques to assess changes in fertilizer usage, crop yield, and economic returns post-SHC implementation. **Detailed Critique:** While the sampling method and analytical approach are sound, the study could benefit from a more detailed description of the soil testing procedures and the criteria for categorizing farmers into small, medium, and large holders. Additionally, incorporating control groups not using SHC recommendations would strengthen the findings by providing a clearer comparative analysis of the SHC's effectiveness. **3. Findings** The findings indicate positive outcomes from the SHC Scheme, including a reduction in chemical fertilizer use, increased application of organic alternatives, and improved economic returns. Specifically, the study highlights a 9.38% increase in wheat yield and a significant improvement in the benefit-cost ratio for farmers following SHC recommendations. The presentation of findings is comprehensive; however, it lacks depth in discussing the biochemical or soil physicochemical processes that might explain the observed changes in crop	

	yield and health. For a more scientific audience, detailing the soil nutrient dynamics pre and post-SHC application would add value. Furthermore, the study could enhance its impact by discussing long-term sustainability implications of these shifts in fertilizer practices. **4. Limitations** The original article acknowledges several limitations, including the scope of SHC awareness among farmers and the operational capacity of soil testing facilities. It also points to the need for more widespread education on the benefits of the SHC. **Detailed Critique:** The limitations section appropriately identifies logistical and educational barriers; however, it overlooks potential biases in farmer reporting and the non-uniformity of soil types across sampled areas, which could influence the generalizability of the results. Addressing these scientific and methodological limitations would provide a clearer pathway for future research and implementation strategies. **5. The Way Forward** The article suggests enhancing SHC awareness and expanding soil testing facilities. It advocates for a systematic approach to integrating SHC insights with traditional farming practices to maximize productivity and sustainability. While these recommendations are practical, they could be expanded to include the development of digital tools for real-time soil health monitoring and data management, which would help in scaling the SHC's impact. Furthermore, proposing specific policy interventions that incentivize SHC adoption through subsidies or rewards could accelerate uptake among hesitant farmers. **6. Conclusion** The reviewed article makes significant contributions to understanding the economic and agricultural impacts of the SHC Scheme in Madhya Pradesh. It successfully uses empirical data to argue for the continuation and expansion of the scheme, making it a valuable resource for stakeholders in the agricultural sector. **Recommendations for Publication:** The article is recommended for publication with moderate revisions. Enhancements should focus on expanding the scientific discussion of soil nutrient changes, incorporating control groups or longitudinal studies to better attribute observed changes to the SHC, and providing more detailed policy recommendations to support SHC implementation. These improvements will ensure the research meets high scientific standards and provides actionable insights for enhancing agricultural productivity and sustainability in developing regions.	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**		
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Fraol Balcha**
Department, University & Country	**Graduate School of Agriculture, Tokyo University of Agriculture, Japan**