

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_125048
Title of the Manuscript:	To study the Farmer's attitude towards drip irrigation and traditional irrigation system in Junagadh district, Gujarat
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Hello, this article is written very superficially, especially in the methods and methods section, it should be more clearly stated how the work was done.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Assessment of farmer's attitude towards drip and traditional irrigation systems in Jungad district, Gujarat	
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.	No, the materials and methods should be explained more in the abstract	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	Yes, because the references are given and the structure is observed from the scientific point of view, a thank you section can be added at the end.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, but newer references can be added in the introduction section	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	I feel that the materials and methods and the number of farmers who were questioned should have been more than 160 people, as well as the results and discussion.	

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Seyed Arman Hosseini Beryekhani
Department, University & Country	University of Birjand, Iran