

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_128522
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Farmers' Knowledge on e-NAM: Advancing Agricultural Market Transformation in Nizamabad District, Telangana
Type of the Article	Research

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is suitable for the scientific community as the study has proper methodology and scientific analysis. The study also talked about the e-NAM initiative which is a recent one. Overall, the study has its own implications in terms of finding the gap between the non-adoption and adoption of e-NAM.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, the title of article is not suitable. "Assessing Farmers Knowledge on e-NAM at Nizamabad district of Telangana"	
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.	No, abstract is not comprehensive. Divide the abstract under following sub-heads without mentioning the sub-heads: Introduction (Background, introduce e-NAM, Problem statement: 2-3 line under each sub- head). Research Methodology (mention the methodology which is completely missing in abstract). Results and Discussion Conclusion and Implication of study	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The study has proper methodology and analysis however, following corrections need to be incorporated. Introduction: Shift the two lines of second para to first para (regarding GDP contribution). Research Methodology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mention the type of methodology used • Mention the type of statistical techniques. • Mention the procedure of knowledge test. • How categories were formed (low medium and high)? • Introduce correlation as well in methodology. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and recent; however, the style of referencing is not uniform. Please follow the journal guideline regarding the same.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language and quality of article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	While describing results and discussion, perception knowledge has been mentioned that needs to be removed. "Relation between profile characteristics of respondents with their knowledge and perception on e-NAM" (where is perception ??)	

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:	Akanchha Singh
Department, University & Country	GLA University, India