

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_125967
Title of the Manuscript:	Analyzing The Impact of Socio-Economic, Knowledge Level and Buying Behavior of Groundnut Growers Towards Micronutrient Fertilizer in Sabarkantha District
Type of the 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

<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>
<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 study is of great importance as it shows the buying behavior of the ground growers. Additionally, but also the factors affecting the decision to purchase micro-nutrients. However, the main factors are not identified.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, it is, but slight improvements are needed. The suggestion is to add the name of the country.</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>Yes, it is. However, the information on the duration and year of the study should be provided.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript contains all the sub-sections typically needed for a scientific paper, but more improvements are needed.</p> <p><u>In the introduction:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The writing is too short and does not provide sufficient background for the study. - The objectives of the study are not provided, so please add them. - Ver few references are provided, and they are unknown sources. Therefore, please provide as many references as possible for the introduction. <p><u>In the method:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The writing is awkward and unclear because a few paragraphs should be provided instead to clarify the sampling method and the analysis method. - The country name is not provided, so it is clear where the study location is. - The duration and year of the survey was not provided, so we cannot know if the study was really conducted or not. - The statistical software was not clearly mentioned. Please be clear and provide the test names. <p><u>In the results and discussion,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The results for each section are too short, so please elaborate more clearly. - Spacing is not well structured, so please refer to the journal guidelines. - The way to present the results in the table should be rearranged to be more clearly understandable. The comments are given directly in the reviewed manuscript. - The results are provided, but are not properly discussed. So please provide the discussions. <p><u>In the conclusion,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is short enough, but no recommendations are provided. So, please provide some. 	
<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>In terms of correctness, the manuscript needs improvements in terms of clarity and result presentation. If the author can use sample papers available online in the journal to learn how the writing is done in a good way, then the manuscript can suit the journal. Besides that, English proofreading is needed to reduce mistakes in English writing and write clear and short results.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>No, they are not because the whole text has very few references. Please provide as many citations and references as possible to support the statement.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English writing is really good, but some improvements should be made, as shown in the reviewed manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript should be considered for publication only when the author takes serious account of the comments by addressing them clearly, properly, and carefully.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Hin Lyhour
Department, University & Country	Royal University of Agriculture, Cambodia