

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122147
Title of the Manuscript:	e-Saayam – An ICT-based initiative to provide timely technical support to Farmers through AEOs in Karimnagar District of Telangana State
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This paper is relevant for the scientific community because the idea of the paper is new and had a great importance to see a new thing. Since the use of AI is running nowadays so using an ICT based tool to reduce the problem of smallholder farmers is really impressive. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes it is suitable but try to avoid abbreviation here like AEO/ better to write it as Agricultural Extension Office .For the clarity of the paper for the readers 	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you say from; better to add from what year to what. If not better to write in December 2017. • Try to add conclusion and recommendation 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subsections are appropriate but they are shallow and miss recommendations 	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The idea of the paper is impressive and new but it needs support with other scholars finding either in support or reject. • Nothing is supported with scholars finding in the outcome part of the paper. In addition to this the outcome is to shallow so the reader should not get valuable information from this report • There is no plagiarism and ethically correct • But Results are not well written, i.e., it should have a fluent narrative, and also be correct in the citing of work of other scientists • Lacks suitable interpretation for the graphics and table and supporting of other researchers • It seems a report of a single project not scholarly written for publication 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The references are enough and recent but in the body part of the paper it is not supported by citations • But the coherence of the reference is not correctly written. 	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the abstract part it says the AEO –Farmers ratio is appointed 1 in every 2000 Ha and here it says one AEO for every 5000 Ha; so check it • In system Architecture and operation part; it says all 54 AEO..... First let the readers know how many farmers and AEO are found in the district • In the objective part avoid abbreviations .e.g dept. • In Innovation of the project part bulletin 2nd is not clear try to clarify <p>Outcome part:Very shallow outcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How those AEO upgrade their knowledge? Is that because of experience or additional training is given to them or what? Explain in detail with validated and real data. Elaborate it with evidences • The finding seems shallow. What is number of farmers benefited different from number of other farmers benefited .It needs further clarification for the readers • What are those costs? Instead of putting the average cost in general try to list out those costs and then put the average costs. Because we do not know whether it is service cost or the cost incurred because of the misuse of the system • From where the benefit gained? Explain it well • Grass level workers meaning? Explain in detail • Its great if you put those sent messages can be delivered for how many farmers meaning how many farmers are being aware from those sent messages • You should have to explain the data from 2020-2024 .what does this number of messages send tell us ? e.g in 2024 the number of messages are declining ;what does this indicate? does the farmers got other means for information, does the experts reduce communication or what? It needs further clarification • Where is it? The data for 2018-2019 is not found in the paper .try to include it • Better if the author support the research outcome with other researcher findings .It is makes the paper scholarly and attract the scientific community • I recommend to add the detail of advice given to farmers. what was those message sent. E.g regarding sowing?,timely cultivating, pest management or what? with data and evidences <p>In conclusion part ; Par?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Never addressed in major outcome part so where do you get it to conclude here • Focus only on the key outcomes of this paper only • Put your recommendations for further reference for other scholars or any individual who read this paper 	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tigist Kefale Mekonen
Department, University & Country	Debre Markos University, Ethiopia