

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>

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>The research is important as it will provide information on the level of knowledge of sugarcane farmers in the area which will trigger policy recommendations for the improvement of quality of life and economy. However, the manuscript lacks focus on the different technology to be assessed. If possible, the author should provide clear understanding on the subject of the article for the readers to comprehend the article.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is okay since it is direct and easy to understand. By the title itself, one can understand the general objective of the study.</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>There is a need to improve this part. There is no recommendation mentioned as to how to enhance the knowledge of the farmers. There is no call to action mentioned.</p> <p>How these farmers selected? This should be explicitly mentioned here. Are they randomly selected, by purpose? What are these districts?</p> <p>This should be expounded/elaborated since this is abstract. The reader should know what are the statistical analyses used in the study. The use of "etc" in a research article should be avoided since the purpose of publication is information dissemination.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>While it is alright to not include Related Literature, the introduction should explicitly present previous works related to the study.</p> <p>There is no recommendation part. While there is conclusion but there is no recommendation.</p> <p>In the materials and methods, theoretical framework or conceptual framework is suggested to include to ascertain theoretical/conceptual foundation of the study.</p> <p>In the introduction, Instead on delving so much discussion on the sugar production in India, there should be a discussion of the technology mentioned in the title of the article. Are these technology traditional or those new ones? What technology was used as the subject of the assessment of knowledge level? Are there data on the adoption of these technologies?</p> <p>There is a mention on the weather/climate-related reasons for low production but there is no mention how these are connected to the context of the study.</p> <p>The studies presented were obsolete (i.e., Tandel, 1993, Chaudhari, 1994). This represents a dearth in the literature. The authors should look for recent studies not particularly in India but other regions.</p> <p>The 3rd paragraph did not connect to the previous paragraphs as it did not mention the real gap of the research.</p> <p>Therefore, there is a need to revise this part.</p> <p>For the methodology,</p> <p>Other statistical analytics tool mentioned in the abstract were not mentioned in this section. Please include.</p> <p>Provide statistical data on the facts such as how large the sugarcane areas in Yamuna and Rohtak and</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>the contribution of Kaithal to entire sugarcane production. This will provide validity of the chosen areas. Also, it would be better to provide map pointing the research areas for the readers to have visual appreciation of the research locale.</p> <p>How was the randomization done?</p> <p>How did these two villeges are selected? At what basis?</p> <p>How are these sample farmers allocated in each chosen area?</p> <p>Is the instrument underwent reliability test? If so, what is used to measure reliability? Present the result.</p> <p>Since this is correlational, there should be no independent and dependent variables. The author may mention that the variables considered in the study were . .</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>The paper need revision. Read comments in the manuscript. I cannot say that the manuscript is scientifically robust and technical sound. There are things and sections need to be revised.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>There are references that are obsolete. Add more references.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but it is still best to check grammar.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Please see the manuscript.</p>	

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>
<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:	Romiel John P. Basan
Department, University & Country	University of Southern Mindanao, Philippines