

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126910
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON BUYING BEHAVIOUR AND PROBLEMS FACED BY FARMERS TOWARDS ORGANIC FERTILIZER IN DEESA AND PALANPUR TALUKAS OF BANASKANTHA DISTRICT, GUJARAT
Type of the Article	

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)
<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>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the adoption and challenges of using organic fertilizers among farmers in Deesa and Palanpur, Gujarat. By focusing on local farmers' buying behavior and socio-economic factors, the study sheds light on the barriers to and motivators for organic fertilizer adoption, which is crucial for formulating supportive agricultural policies. The research is particularly important for promoting sustainable farming practices in India and supports global environmental goals by reducing reliance on chemical fertilizers.</p> <p>I appreciate this manuscript for its methodical approach, utilizing both primary data from farmers and secondary resources, which enriches its findings and credibility. However, while the study covers extensive quantitative data, a deeper analysis of qualitative aspects such as personal farmer perspectives could enhance understanding of these behavioral factors. Overall, the manuscript makes a significant contribution by informing strategies to increase the uptake of organic fertilizers, crucial for environmental sustainability and agricultural health in India.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title, "<i>A Study on Buying Behaviour and Problems Faced by Farmers Towards Organic Fertilizer in Deesa and Palanpur Talukas of Banaskantha District, Gujarat,</i>" accurately reflects the study's focus on the adoption challenges and purchasing behavior regarding organic fertilizers among farmers in specific regions. However, it could be refined for clarity and conciseness to improve readability and better capture the study's scope. Therefore, I recommend the alternative title "Assessing Farmers' Buying Behavior and Challenges in Adopting Organic Fertilizers: A Case Study from Banaskantha District, Gujarat"</p> <p>This alternative title maintains the original focus but is more streamlined, making it more accessible and impactful for readers. It also highlights the geographical focus as a "case study," which enhances its appeal to a broader scientific audience interested in regional studies and sustainable agriculture practices.</p>	

Review Form 3

<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 of the article generally needs to be comprehensive, covering the study's objectives, methodology, sample characteristics, key findings, and implications. However, in the given article, there are a few areas where it could be improved to enhance clarity and provide a more balanced overview. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p>Suggested Additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purpose Clarity: Although the abstract mentions that the study aims to understand "buying behavior and challenges," explicitly stating how these insights contribute to sustainable agriculture could strengthen the context. For example, adding a sentence about the study's relevance to policy or education initiatives would emphasize its practical implications. 2. Findings on Challenges: While the abstract mentions some challenges (e.g., poor efficiency, delayed effects, and lack of knowledge), it could benefit from a brief summary of how these issues affect farmers' adoption rates. A sentence on how these challenges hinder sustainable agriculture adoption could make the findings more impactful. 3. Recommendations for Action: Including a brief note on potential strategies or policy recommendations derived from the findings would add value. This could highlight specific actions that could improve the adoption of organic fertilizers among farmers. <p>Suggested Deletions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detailed Socio-economic Data: The percentages related to age, income, and education level may be overly specific for an abstract. These details could be summarized in one sentence (e.g., "Farmers in the study were primarily middle-aged with moderate income levels and limited education") to streamline the content and focus on the broader findings. 2. Statistical Methods: While mentioning the "Weighted Average Mean" method is informative, it might not be necessary in an abstract. If the abstract is constrained by word count, this could be removed to focus on core findings and implications instead. <p>Revised Abstract (Suggested):</p> <p>"The adoption of organic fertilizers is rising in India, driven by increased environmental awareness and supportive government policies. This study explores the buying behavior and challenges faced by farmers in Deesa and Palanpur talukas, Banaskantha district, Gujarat. Through interviews with 200 farmers, findings reveal that although a majority express strong interest in organic fertilizers, they face significant challenges, including poor efficiency, delayed effects, and limited knowledge on proper use. Understanding these obstacles is crucial for developing policies that promote sustainable agriculture in India. The study suggests targeted education and support initiatives to enhance adoption rates and improve the efficacy of organic farming practices."</p> <p>This revised abstract is more concise and emphasizes the broader relevance of the study's findings.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure and subsections of this manuscript looks generally appropriate, as they follow a logical and systematic format that is common in research studies. However, a few adjustments could improve readability and the flow of information:</p> <p>Strengths of the Current Structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear Sectioning: The manuscript is well-organized with distinct sections for the <i>Introduction</i>, <i>Materials and Methods</i>, <i>Results and Discussion</i>, and <i>Conclusion</i>. This structure is effective for guiding readers through the research process. 2. Detailed Data Presentation: The subsections under <i>Results and Discussion</i> (e.g., Age of Farmers, Annual Income, Education, etc.) allow for a comprehensive presentation of the data, which provides valuable insights into various socio-economic factors impacting farmers' behavior toward organic fertilizer. <p>However, I recommend the Structural Improvements as suggested below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Combine Smaller Subsections: Some subsections, such as <i>Marital Status of Farmers</i> and <i>Family Size</i>, could be consolidated with other demographic details to streamline the manuscript. Combining smaller sections can help reduce fragmentation and improve readability. 2. Reorganize Results and Discussion: Currently, the <i>Results and Discussion</i> section contains a sequence of detailed tables without much integration or comparison with prior research. To enhance readability, consider dividing this section into two parts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Results: Present core data, including demographic information and key findings, using descriptive tables. o Discussion: Analyze and interpret the results in relation to prior studies, highlighting significant trends and their implications. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>3. Add a Dedicated Limitations Section: Including a brief subsection on limitations (either at the end of the <i>Discussion</i> or before the <i>Conclusion</i>) can add transparency. This could mention any sample size restrictions, geographic specificity, or potential biases due to sampling.</p> <p>4. Expand Conclusion and Recommendations: The conclusion could be expanded to include more actionable recommendations based on the findings. This section could be titled "Conclusion and Policy Recommendations" to emphasize practical applications and help the scientific and policy-making community draw actionable insights.</p> <p>5. Add a Background Subsection within Introduction: A brief <i>Background</i> subsection could be helpful, focusing on the importance of organic fertilizers in sustainable agriculture and the context in Gujarat. This would provide readers unfamiliar with the topic a quick summary before diving into study specifics.</p> <p>Summary of Suggested Structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Background (suggested addition) ○ Objectives (suggested addition) 2. Literature Review (suggested addition) 3. Materials and Methods 4. Results 5. Discussion (with integration of related literature) 6. Limitations (suggested addition) 7. Conclusion and Policy Recommendations <p>These modifications would enhance the manuscript's flow and allow readers to gain insights efficiently, as well as provide a clearer link between findings and their broader significance.</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>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound, as it employs a well-defined research methodology that includes both primary and secondary data sources. The use of a purposive sampling method ensures that the study accurately targets farmers with relevant knowledge of organic fertilizers, enhancing the reliability of the findings. Moreover, the data analysis through descriptive statistics and Weighted Average Mean (WAM) calculations provides a structured and quantitative approach, allowing for meaningful interpretation of farmers' buying behavior and challenges. The comprehensiveness of the data—covering demographic, socio-economic, and behavioral factors—adds depth to the research, making it a valuable contribution to understanding the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices in the region.</p>	
<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>The manuscript includes a variety of references that provide foundational insights into organic fertilizer usage, the environmental impacts of chemical fertilizers, and the Indian agricultural context. However, while some references are recent, others are out dated, and a few key areas could benefit from additional, more current sources to strengthen the literature review and discussion.</p> <p>Suggested Areas for Additional References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recent Trends in Organic Fertilizer Adoption: Given the rapid evolution in sustainable agricultural practices, including a recent review or meta-analysis on global or Indian trends in organic fertilizer adoption would enhance the relevance of the literature. A more recent reference than 2020 could provide updated perspectives on adoption rates and challenges. 2. Farmer Behavior and Attitudes towards Sustainable Practices: Including studies that focus on farmers' behavioral and psychological factors influencing sustainable practices could provide depth to the discussion. Such references could help contextualize the findings in terms of broader social and economic influences. 	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication, as it effectively conveys the study's objectives, methodology, and findings. The manuscript uses technical terminology accurately and maintains a formal tone, which is appropriate for academic readers. However, there are some areas where minor improvements in clarity and readability would enhance the presentation: <ol style="list-style-type: none">Conciseness: Some sections, especially the abstract and results, could be more concise. Streamlining repetitive details would help focus the reader's attention on the main findings.Grammatical Precision: A few phrases could benefit from grammatical adjustments to improve fluency. For example, sentences that list data points could be rephrased to improve flow and readability.Use of Transitional Phrases: Adding transitional phrases, particularly in the discussion, would help clarify the logical flow between findings and interpretations, enhancing the readability for a scholarly audience.Reduction of Redundancies: Repetitive use of phrases like "buying behavior and challenges faced by farmers" could be minimized by varying wording slightly to maintain reader engagement. Overall, the article's language is on par with scholarly standards, but these adjustments would further improve readability and engagement for academic audiences.	
Optional/General comments	Nil	

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:	Dilip Kumar Darjee
Department, University & Country	Indira Gandhi National Open University, India