

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_115507
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Mechanization Index in Sugarcane Cultivation: A Case Study in Mandya District, Karnataka
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>	<p>1.Its important to the scientific community if the author tried to be understood the :</p> <p>a.Flow of ideas.There are glaring repetitions in the definition of “mechanization “ in the abstract and within the main paper body in chapter 1. Ideally the definition should have been based on the work of: Verma (2008) ;Khalequzzaman and Karim(2007).</p> <p>b.The power of figures in depicting the nature of business environment:this has not been harnessed completely by not engaging the mathematical rule of placement of how many ones,tens,hundreds ,thousands are within a number.For example what does a number 4,98,244 mean for total geographical area?</p> <p>c.”Sown area” is “ cultivated area” ?-use of unconventional terms</p> <p>2 The paper title could improved by adding” India” as to read: “Assessment of Mechanization Index in Sugarcane Cultivation: A Case Study in Mandya District, Karnataka India”</p> <p>3.The abstract needs to capture ,in summary, study methodology and key outcomes which were done.</p> <p>4.The section of developing farmer classes was well done so were “blanket’ mechanization treatments NO questionnaire was however displayed. Moreover no clear indication was given for measurement in engaging the mechanization by any class of farmers.a farmer frequencies or what ?</p> <p>5. Its scientifically correct with due data presentation in the introduction for creation of participatory engagement of interested parties in learning and understanding the agricultural business environment. Despite this challenge the study showed nil engagement of mechanization in planting and harvesting while seedbed preparation, weed/spraying(weed control) irrigation averaged 50.5%.Manual labour played a significant role in sugarcane production Karnataka. In this two sugarcane farm operations</p> <p>6.The references are adequate:This being a straight forward input / output variable investigation,</p>	<p>K</p>
<p>1. Arim 20</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>NONE</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Aggrey W.Wanjala
Department, University & Country	Kenya