

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126527
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Constraints faced by Farmers of Rajasthan State in the Adoption of Improved Kinnow Production Technology</b>
Type of the Article	

#### 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>
<b>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.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides insight into the specific constraints faced by kinnow farmers in Rajasthan, highlighting barriers that may also be relevant for other regions with similar agricultural challenges. By identifying technical, environmental, financial, marketing, and socio-personal constraints, the study sheds light on critical factors affecting the adoption of improved horticultural technologies.</li> <li>I appreciate this manuscript because it addresses a significant gap in understanding the limitations of the National Horticulture Mission (NHM) at the grassroots level, especially in a district where participation is high. The focus on specific constraints like land suitability, water scarcity, and lack of timely sales offers a realistic view of the practical challenges farmers face.</li> <li>Additionally, the manuscript's recommendation for periodical training sessions to boost awareness and skills among kinnow growers provides actionable insights that can be leveraged by policymakers and agricultural extension services to improve technology adoption rates.</li> </ul>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> This manuscript appears scientifically robust as it systematically addresses the constraints faced by kinnow growers using a structured approach that categorizes challenges into technical, environmental, financial, marketing, and socio-personal constraints. This clear categorization allows for a focused analysis of each barrier to technology adoption.  <input type="checkbox"/> The selection of Sri Ganganagar district, where the highest number of NHM-registered farmers are present, adds credibility to the study, ensuring a representative sample within the context of Rajasthan's kinnow production.  <input type="checkbox"/> The manuscript's findings are well-aligned with its objectives, as it identifies key constraints and suggests targeted solutions, such as regular training, to address the identified gaps. This practical approach makes the study scientifically sound and valuable for developing interventions to support	

**Review Form 3**

	farmers.  <input type="checkbox"/> Overall, the manuscript's conclusions are logically derived from the analysis presented, strengthening its scientific validity and practical applicability for the agricultural and research community.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -	<b>Yes</b>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The abstract is clear, concise, and communicates the study's purpose, methodology, and findings effectively, which is essential for academic readability.</li> <li>• The terminology used, such as "technical constraints," "financial constraints," and "socio-personal constraints," is appropriate for scholarly discussions and aligns well with the field of agricultural studies.</li> <li>• However, minor improvements in phrasing could enhance readability. Overall, the language is precise and meets the standards for scholarly communication.</li> </ul>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript addresses a timely and relevant issue in agriculture by exploring barriers to the adoption of improved kinnow production technologies among farmers in Rajasthan. The findings are practical and provide valuable insights for policymakers, agricultural extension programs, and farmers alike. I recommend accepting the manuscript.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Vikas Kumar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Himachal Pradesh University, India</b>