

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126074
Title of the Manuscript:	Technology Intervention Through Cluster Frontline Demonstration in Indian Mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i>) in Arid Region of Western Rajasthan
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper is very important specially for the mustard growers through driving information in production and productivity, for policy purpose and others Again, the manuscript helps to know the importance of the technology, its adoption rate and evaluate its impacts among users or beneficiaries.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of course yes, but I suggest slight modifications like this; Demonstrations of Indian Mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i>) Technologies through Cluster Frontline Mechanism in Arid Regions of Western Rajasthan 	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>Yes, but at the beginning of abstracts, the sentences are lengthy enough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete extra words and also try to make clear and shorten the sentences. And make clear to conclude and recommend in clear sentences rather than repeating the same idea in again and again. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it is good	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The Manuscript is robust as it follows some manuscript criteria. It has Title, objective, methods/ design, and output which makes it sound and attractive. It follows specific testing methods (like farmers and stakeholders perceptions, and used materials for the treatments under this study It provided hints or information among technology package and the local practices.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There are some old references ((Shivani and Kumar, 2002), and also further referencing also suggested.	
Minor REVISION comments	It is good, but there is some editing errors. Again, some of the sentences are overlapped.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Above all, make sure to correct all the above given comments, editing check-up and also it needs to put source to some figures or pictures	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alemayehu Bashe Bade
Department, University & Country	South Ethiopia Agricultural Research Institute, Areka Agricultural Research Center, Ethiopia