

Review Form 3

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>

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it contributes valuable insights into the problems faced by the tribal farmers while utilising the medicinally important plants for human and animal health, which may enhance current understanding and drive future research on solving the problem. It presents perspectives that could address existing gaps in knowledge. I appreciate the manuscript for its clear articulation of the problem and its potential impact on related studies. However, I believe that certain sections could benefit from deeper analysis.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>In my opinion, the title could be "Constraints analysis of adoption of Ethno-Medical Practices in Idukki district of Kerala"</p>	
<p>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>	<p>The first line of the abstract should include the general introduction about the topic which is missing in the abstract. The sentence in the abstract is too long which could potentially be splitted into 3 to 4 sentences to make it less overwhelming. A concluding sentence could be added about the role of this study to overcome the constraints in the adoption of ethno-medical practices. The abstract included all the constraints found but doesn't talk anything about the ranking. It would be better to add concise information about the highly ranking constraints in the abstract with the ratings they received.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Methodology section can be subdivided into subsections: study site, sampling, questionnaire preparation and ranking method, statistical analysis to make it more easier for the scientific community to understand this paper. Also, result and discussion can be included as two different topics.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Lacks sufficient details and key statistical analyses which makes it difficult to assess the reliability of data. Also, the manuscript does not have enough literature cited limiting it to a broader scientific context. The paper should have also included the opportunities and advantages of using ethno-medical practices to make this study more robust.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The author has included very few references in the manuscript. More references are required in the introduction section and the discussion section.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are many grammatical and typos errors for which thorough revision is necessary.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction: Introduction is very short. The author needs to add more references about similar studies about the constraints and adoption of ethnomedical practices.</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More information is required about the site of the study. Please add a map showing the location of the study and include its geocoordinate in the method. 2. There is a table in the method to explain about the rating system but it is not named as table. Please add this as table 1 with the table caption. 3. Please cite the method used in ranking if this method was previously used by other researchers. 4. It would be better to include the questionnaire used in the survey as the supplementary materials for the paper. 5. There is no statistical analysis conducted to see if there was any difference between the scores between different constraints. 6. How many responses were received from each farmer on average? How was the open ended questionnaire merged together to give an average score and provide a ranking. More details are required about this. <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The table used in the result section has not been referenced anywhere in the text. Please add it. 2. What was the average rating received for all the constraints? <p>Conclusion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The conclusion section should provide a summary, but it lacks alignment with subsections of the manuscript 2. Some statement seem unsupportive by the findings, rather they should be drawn from the data presented 3. Informations in the conclusion cannot be added if they are not already established in the results and discussion sections 	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bhawana Regmi
Department, University & Country	Agriculture and Forestry University, Nepal