

## Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAEES_123585</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Chatbot for promoting best crop management practices to rice farmers in Odisha</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short Research Article</b>

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript offers valuable insights into leveraging chatbot technology to enhance agricultural extension services, specifically for rice farmers in Odisha. The study addresses a significant gap in real-time advisory systems for farmers, making it relevant to the scientific community working on ICT in agriculture. However, the limited sample size and scope of the study reduce its broader applicability. Overall, it provides a promising foundation for future research in scaling digital tools for rural agricultural development.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, It is suitable	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract provides a clear overview of the study, including the problem addressed, the development of the chatbot, and key findings. However, it could benefit from briefly mentioning the specific limitations of the study, such as the small sample size or geographic scope, to give a more balanced summary. Additionally, including more details about the chatbot's impact on farming outcomes would strengthen the abstract.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, covering essential aspects such as the introduction, methodology, results, and discussion. However, the "Results and Discussion" section could be better organized by clearly separating the results from the discussion to enhance readability. Including a dedicated "Limitations" subsection would also improve the structure and provide a more transparent evaluation of the study.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically sound as it follows a structured research approach, including surveys and user studies to gather data from rice farmers in Odisha. The use of established digital tools such as the Rice Knowledge Bank and Rice Crop Manager enhances the credibility of the content provided by the chatbot. However, the scientific robustness is somewhat limited by the small sample size and the absence of a control group for comparison, which restricts the generalizability of the findings. Overall, the methodology is appropriate, but further validation is needed for broader application.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :	The references cited in the manuscript are relevant but could be updated with more recent studies, especially those focused on advancements in chatbot technology and its application in agriculture. While most references are relevant to the topic, some sources are older, such as the 2017 and 2018 publications, and could be supplemented with more recent research to reflect current trends in ICT for agriculture. I recommend including recent studies on AI-based agricultural tools and the broader impact of digital technologies on farming practices.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

## Review Form 3

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jayantkumar Vijay Rane</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The Rashtrasant Tukadoji Maharaj Nagpur University, India</b>