

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123172
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and Validation of a Knowledge Test for Assessing Dryland Farmers' Understanding of Redgram Cultivation
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.	The manuscripts is important to give a scientific information to minimize drought impacts for dryland farmers. I like this manuscripts, because it assess the basic knowledge of dryland farmers regarding critical interventions in major staple crops such as redgram. It focus on scenarios that are common in redgram cultivation in dryland areas.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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.	It is comprehensive. 1. If the author add an additional focus on crop management, harvesting and post harvesting area, it is better to test. 2. the title includes important keywords like "dryland farmers," "knowledge test," and "redgram cultivation" which are likely to be relevant for search and indexing	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Its appropriate because it does not mislead about the content of the study—i.e., that it already focus on a knowledge test and a different aspect of redgram cultivation or farming practices.	
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.	1. manuscripts reflects that both the creation (development) and testing (validation) of the knowledge test are already addressed 2. assessment of understanding is clearly mentioned 3. The manuscripts accurately reflected the content and focus of the study, ensured that there are no discrepancies between the title and the actual study. 4.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It's not sufficient and needs a lot	
Minor REVISION comments	Minor revision needed	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	No competing interest issue that engaging and likely to attract the attention of the intended audience, including researchers, practitioners, and policymakers.	

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yaekob Lorato Lomba
Department, University & Country	Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia