

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_124619
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Drip Irrigation among the Onion Growers in Tamil Nadu, India
Type of the Article	Research Article

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study provides practical insights into how drip irrigation can enhance productivity while conserving water, which is crucial for water-scarce regions like Tamil Nadu. Despite its relevance, the manuscript requires clearer presentation of data, a better connection between the materials and methods, results and conclusions, and a more detailed discussion to strengthen its scientific credibility. A strong introduction is missing in this manuscript. The current introduction lacks depth and fails to effectively establish the significance of the study. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The original title implied a broader scope (all of Tamil Nadu), which was inaccurate since the study is limited to Thondamuthur Block. So, revise the title to make it specific and accurately reflect the geographic focus of the research</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract lacks a logical flow and clear organization. It jumps between topics without smooth transitions, making it harder for the reader to follow the main points. Phrases such as "cent (100.00%)" and "majority" are repeated unnecessarily The abstract presents some results in broad terms without sufficient context. For example, stating that "84.90% of the respondents were able to fulfill their needs" lacks detail on what those needs are. The abstract does not adequately establish the significance of the study or the relevance of drip irrigation in the context of onion cultivation. More background information could help frame the research's importance. The term "onion" should not be capitalized in the middle of sentences The abstract does not summarize the overall conclusions or implications of the study's findings, leaving readers without a sense of the broader impact of the research. Add few keywords after abstract 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate all the corrections mentioned in the manuscript <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction lacks depth and should provide a clearer objective. Incorporating recent references will strengthen this section. In the introduction, replace unsuitable synonyms with more appropriate words; for example, use "localized" instead of "regionalized." The introduction should be structured to flow logically from background information to specific research objectives. A separate literature review section is unnecessary. Instead, relevant references should be integrated within the introduction, which affects the overall structure. <p>In Materials and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly specify how the data were collected, including the methods used and the time duration of the study. Improve the quality of English and phrasing throughout this section, as there are noted issues that need correction. Provide a more detailed description of the materials and methodologies used in the study. The mention of "general factors" needs clarification or elaboration to provide a comprehensive view of the research design. Clearly define or elaborate on what the "general factors" mentioned in the article are. Include a map of the study area to visually represent the location and context of the research. Paragraphs conveys the main idea of the study, it needs improvements in structure, clarity, and conciseness to effectively communicate the materials and methodology <p>Results and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly mention how the overall impact of the drip irrigation system among onion growers is classified into low, medium, and high categories (in section 4.1). Specify the factors considered 	

Review Form 3

	<p>for this classification and clarify whether the impacts are positive or negative. Use direct percentages instead of fractions (e.g., one-tenth or $\frac{3}{4}$) when discussing the impact. Remove any repeated analyses to maintain clarity. Include percentage responses from farmers regarding water scarcity, yield, and other relevant aspects to strengthen the discussion in Section 4.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is insufficient discussion regarding the implications of the findings. Each aspect considered in the study should be explored, linking back to the results and providing insights into their significance. • Clarity of Statements: Some statements are scientifically incorrect and need to be revised to improve accuracy (mentioned in the manuscripts) • Regarding Table 2: Rewrite the findings to express each category separately, avoiding the phrase "followed by." • Clarify where the sufficient money comes from, specifically if it is derived from onion farming with drip irrigation. More detailed explanations are required. • Table 3: Add categories linking social statuses specifically to drip irrigation, removing irrelevant categories that do not pertain to the study. • Section 4.2.3. Revise the results presentation similar to Table 2. Discuss how many respondents felt water usage decreased after adopting the drip irrigation system. Clarify the statement regarding the increase in area; provide real values to show how much the area increased and how additional areas were created. • Section 4.2.4: Replace "cent percentage" with references to "all respondents." Ensure similar corrections are applied as in Section 4.2.1. • "This is due to the rationale that, as the water is been discharged only at certain nozzles in the drip-tube, water cannot be spilt from other spots of the drip tube." Rewrite the statement regarding water discharge from the drip tube to ensure scientific accuracy and clarity. • Section 4.2.5: Instead of focusing on the number of labourers, discuss labour usage in terms of time taken for irrigation tasks and the associated labour costs. • Include detailed discussion with proper citations <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion should be rewritten to focus solely on the data discussed in the manuscript. General statements or statistics not directly derived from the study should be avoided. • The study mostly used references from 2018 and earlier, so include more recent studies from after 2022. 	
<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>This manuscript exhibits scientific rigor and technical soundness through its focused examination of the impact of drip irrigation on onion growers in Thondamuthur block, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu. It highlights the significance of specific percentage responses from farmers regarding water usage and yield, reinforcing the credibility of its findings. By addressing areas for improvement, such as enhancing clarity and detail in presenting results, the manuscript demonstrates a commitment to delivering accurate and reliable insights into the benefits of drip irrigation for sustainable agriculture.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>No. Need to add more recent references.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Need to improve the language and clearer presentation of data</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Need serious major revision</p>	

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:	Shaheemath Suhara K K
Department, University & Country	Kelappaji College of Agricultural Engineering and Food Technology, India