

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_124099
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF FARMERS KNOWLEDGE LEVEL ON TURMERIC CULTIVATION PRACTICES
Type of the Article	Original Research 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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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.	Turmeric is an important crop with wide family use, as most families in the world use this crop, and taking care of it and developing its cultivation is an important matter, and shedding light on the farmers of this crop and standing on their levels of knowledge and skills and applying the outcomes of scientific research by conducting evaluation studies is one of the obligatory matters, so the researcher succeeded in choosing this topic	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	The article summary needs some additions, which I will explain in the notes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, but some of them need some modifications and additions.	
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- The researcher used the scientific method in conducting this study. 2- The researcher used appropriate statistical methods in the research. 3- The researcher succeeded in choosing a topic of some importance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- The sample size is weak and does not match the nature of the research. Also, the method of drawing the sample, its method, and the scientific approach used to determine it were not addressed.</li> <li>2- The objectives of the research must be clear and specific, and there must also be research hypotheses. The objectives must be mentioned after the introduction.</li> <li>3- The researcher did not address how to test knowledge and what method was used, nor did he specify what the research tool was. Also, measuring the dependent variable was completely absent in the research.</li> <li>4- All the study results I did not find logical explanations for those results, and the research lacks previous studies to make comparisons</li> <li>5- In the introduction, I did not find any research problem from which the researcher could start his research. It is necessary to use local statistics and data that reflect productivity and are a starting point for determining the cognitive level.</li> <li>6- In the results, specifically the first objective, the researcher did not explain how the respondents were classified into three categories.</li> <li>7- The researcher did not explain the total research community and how five villages were selected from among the total number of villages.</li> <li>8- There should be a detailed description of the scale used in the research and how the scale scores were determined.</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Adnan Ibrahim Khamis</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Fallujah, Iraq</b></p>