

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125559
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Farmers' Knowledge of Sugarcane Production Technology in Haryana, India
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>

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.	It's good for rising sugar cane production	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Assessing Farmers' Knowledge of Sugarcane Production Technologies in Haryana, India"	

Review Form 3

<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>Summarize the key findings, methodology, and main conclusions of your study. Be sure to highlight the importance of understanding knowledge scores among farmers in Hayan, India, and mention the main factors that influenced these scores.</p> <p>Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study Areas in Hayan, India: Clearly state the three specific regions or districts where your study was conducted. <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge Score vs. Percentage Assessment: Clarify how you assessed the knowledge score of participants (e.g., using a scaled scoring system rather than a simple percentage). Include a description of the scale, such as a Likert scale, and explain how it better captures nuances in knowledge levels. • Key Factors and Correlation: When discussing how education, income, social participation, and media exposure were positively correlated with farmers' knowledge levels, refer to Table 2 for specific statistics (e.g., correlation coefficients). "Positively related" indicates that as these factors increase, knowledge scores also increase. <p>Interpretation (Conclusion)</p> <p>Ensure the concluding statements are presented under the heading "Interpretation" instead of "Conclusion."</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes but on methodology part should show how did you manage to analyse data clearly</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>In summary, the title plays a critical role in summarizing the study, ensuring it is relevant, searchable, and accessible to the right audience.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Ensure your references are up-to-date, with at least some being from within the last five years. Replace older citations where possible to reflect more recent research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It clearly and convenient</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Make some revisions to highlighted areas</p>	

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:	James Ngalaba
Department, University & Country	Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania