

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123569
Title of the Manuscript:	UTILITY PERCEPTION OF FARMERS TOWARDS M-KISAN
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

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>	<p>The manuscript contributes to the body of knowledge for the scientific community especially in the area of accessing agricultural information. However, the following comments are provided to improve the content of the manuscript</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. State the motivation for this study ii. State the objective for conducting the state iii. Make a separate section for literature review and review relevant literature 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>No, I suggest the title to be</p> <p>FARMERS' PERCEPTION TOWARDS THE UTILIZATION OF M-KISAN FOR ACCESSING AGRICULTURAL INFORMATION in BHAVNAGAR DISTRICT OF GUJARAT, IINDIA</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>	<p>The abstract is not comprehensive. Motivation for the study or research problem is lacking; major findings of the study are also not captured in the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>NO, some subsections in the paper are missing. No study's specific objective, no section for literature review, and limitations for the study</p>	
<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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The manuscript addresses the critical issue of risk and uncertainty in agriculture, particularly in the context of Indian farmers who often face challenges due to inadequate information on inputs and crop management. ii. It highlights the potential of Information and Communication Technology (ICT), specifically through the m-Kisan portal, to mitigate these issues by providing timely updates via SMS iii. The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it addresses a pertinent issue in agriculture—information gaps affecting farmers—by evaluating the effectiveness of a government-supported ICT initiative, the m-Kisan portal. iv. It employs a clear methodology with data collected from a systematic sample of 120 respondents across multiple villages, ensuring a structured approach to analysis. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>No, the author(s) need to consult more literature to make the manuscript richer. Here are some suggested works for the authors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Rabbi, F., M. Idrees, S. Ali, M. Zamin and H. Bilal. 2020. Farmers' perceptions and adoption of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in peach (<i>Prunus persica</i> L.) production and marketing. <i>Sarhad Journal of Agriculture</i>, 36(3): 882-893. DOI http://dx.doi.org/10.17582/journal.sja/2020/36.3.882.893 II. Alao A. et al (2021) Rural Farmers' Perceptions of the Adoption of Internet-enabled Computer in the Eastern Cape, South Africa <i>Journal of Human Ecology</i>, 73(1-3): 1-14 DOI: 10.31901/24566608.2021/73.1-3.3235 III. Zheng, H., Ma, W., Boansi, D., & Owusu, V. (2023). Farmers' perceptions, adoption and impacts of integrated water management technology under changing climate. <i>International Journal of Water Resources Development</i>, 40(3), 425–447. https://doi.org/10.1080/07900627.2023.2196351 IV. Agussabti, A., Rahmaddiansyah, R., Hamid, A., Zakaria, Z., Munawar, A. & Abu Bakar, B. (2022). Farmers' perspectives on the adoption of smart farming technology to support food farming in Aceh Province, Indonesia. <i>Open Agriculture</i>, 7(1), 857-870. 	

Review Form 3

	https://doi.org/10.1515/opag-2022-0145	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Although the language of the manuscript is fair, however, there is a need for improvement	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hassan Mallam Ibrahim
Department, University & Country	Nasarawa State University, Nigeria