

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> |
|---|--|--|
| 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. | This manuscript addresses a crucial area of study by exploring the utility perception of the m-Kisan portal among farmers, which is vital for understanding how ICT can bridge the information gap in agriculture. The empirical data on the portal's effectiveness, the manuscript provides valuable insights for policymakers and researchers working on digital inclusion and sustainable agricultural development. I appreciate its contribution to the broader discussion on leveraging technology for poverty reduction and rural empowerment. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title of the manuscript is suitable. One more suggested title can be used " Perception of Farmers Towards M-Kisan Initiative" | |
| 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's abstract is comprehensive. It provides a clear overview but could benefit from specifying the research findings in more detail. Consider briefly mentioning key insights or conclusions drawn from the study, such as how the utility perception impacted farmer behavior or decision-making. This will give a more complete picture of the study's outcomes. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | The structure of the manuscript does not fulfill the study's purpose, resulting in missed key points. | |
| 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. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The research paper does not maintain the standard of the journal. 2. The review part is missing from the study. 3. The research methodology part is not explored. 4. The latest references are not included in the study. 5. The research techniques are not representing the clear picture of the study. More research techniques are required to apply to complete the article. 6. The discussion part is not mentioned and the conclusion part is also not enough to show the clear picture of the study. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The references are not enough to meet the standard of manuscripts. The references section contains only articles up to the year 2015. The author needs to add the latest studies up to 2024. | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The author needs to improve the language and sentences of the article to meet the standard of the journal. | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | | |

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: | Pawan Kumar |
| Department, University & Country | SRM University, India |