

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_122918
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Cluster Front Line Demonstrations (CFLDs) in summer green gram production in Faridabad district of Haryana
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 (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.	This publication is interesting to the scientific community because it shows that, in comparison to traditional farmer practices (463 kg/ha), the adoption of enhanced technologies through Cluster Front Line Demonstrations (CFLDs) dramatically boosted the production of summer green gram by 36.3% (627 kg/ha). With an average extension gap of 1.60 q/ha and a technology gap of 4.72 q/ha, it addresses key gaps in both technology and extension, identifying regions that require additional improvement in the spread of technology. With an average net return of Rs. 23,810/ha with better technologies compared to Rs. 15,700/ha under farmers' methods and a greater benefit-cost ratio of 2.23 compared to 1.88, the study also demonstrates significant economic gains. This evidence-based approach provides valuable insights for enhancing agricultural productivity and profitability, making it a significant contribution to sustainable farming practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable for article	
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.	While the abstract is complete, it might be made better by adding specific information on economic benefits, like benefit-cost ratios and net returns, to paint a more vivid picture of the impact. A brief discussion of the extension and any technological gaps would also emphasize the difficulties in addition to the achievements. It can be easier to make the material more succinct and clearer by eliminating words that are superfluous.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Well enough	
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.	The work provides a well-structured study of data gathered over three years from 175 demonstrations, effectively contrasting better technology with conventional techniques. This makes it both technically and scientifically solid. Transparency and dependability of the results are ensured by the statistical data, which includes yield differences, extension and technology gaps, and economic analysis, which are given in an understandable manner and bolstered by pertinent tables. The validity and credibility of the results are increased by the study's conclusions, which are in line with the data and findings from related studies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	To increase the relevance of the article, the references may be updated with more recent studies from the last five years, even though they are currently applicable. A more up-to-date viewpoint would be offered by incorporating recent research on enhanced agricultural techniques, pulse crop management, and the efficacy of extension services.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally clear. Good enough	
Optional/General comments	no	

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:	Ravi Kishan Soni
Department, University & Country	RNB Global University, India