

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJAEES_125563 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Constraints Faced by the Tribal farmers in the Adoption of Ethno-Medical Practices in Idukki district of Kerala |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of „**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

| <u>Compulsory</u> 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. | This work is important at it try to reveal the constraints of the local community on adopting the medicinal plant usage to improve the health conditions of the local community. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | suitable | |
| 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. | Add a sentence from the introduction part Add sentence from the methodology part Delete the phrase "too much or less rainfall and often drought" Delete it requires more time | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | No need to have section 2 Specific objective | |
| 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. | This work is scientifically robust because it mentioned the method of sampling and size of samples interviewed. Ranking of constraints scores averaged correctly. The methodology fits to meet the objectives of the study. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. = | References are not sufficient especially in the section of Results and Discussion. Which results are in conformity? Please cite article with respect to each and every findings you brought and discuss the agreement or dis-agreement of your results with the results of previous works of similar kind. In each paragraph discuss your result in contrast to other works at different time or place. | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | Yes | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | | |

Comment [AW1]: You mentioned it is time consuming in the beginning of the sentences, therefore this is redundancy.

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? | <u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Name: | Abebe Worku Amberbir |
| Department, University & Country | Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia |