

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
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	

#### 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>

#### PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it addresses critical gaps in the adoption and implementation of the Electronic National Agriculture Market (e-NAM) in Nizamabad district, Telangana. By providing an in-depth analysis of farmers' knowledge and identifying barriers such as digital literacy, infrastructure challenges, and awareness, the study highlights actionable strategies to enhance e-NAM's adoption. It offers valuable insights for policymakers, researchers, and stakeholders into designing targeted capacity-building programs and digital interventions to bridge knowledge gaps and improve market efficiency. Furthermore, the findings contribute to the broader discourse on leveraging digital platforms to revolutionize agricultural marketing and enhance farmer incomes.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title of the article, "Assessing Farmers' Knowledge on e-NAM: Advancing Agricultural Market Transformation in Nizamabad District, Telangana," is informative and reflects the focus of the study. However, it could be made more concise and engaging while retaining its relevance. So, I humbly suggest an alternative title as "Bridging Knowledge Gaps in e-NAM Adoption: A Study in Nizamabad District, Telangana". This title emphasizes the key focus on knowledge gaps and their impact on e-NAM adoption, while being concise and appealing to readers interested in agricultural market transformation.	
<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>	The abstract of the article is fairly comprehensive, offering a clear overview of the study's focus, methodology, findings, and implications. However, it could be further enhanced with minor adjustments for clarity and balance. Here are some suggestions: <b>Strengths:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Purpose and Scope:</b> The abstract effectively introduces the study's focus on farmers' knowledge of e-NAM in Nizamabad, Telangana, and highlights the broader agricultural market transformation goals.</li> <li><b>Findings:</b> The knowledge levels of different stakeholders are presented, giving readers a sense of the study's key results.</li> <li><b>Recommendations:</b> The abstract outlines actionable steps such as workshops, user-friendly tools, and policy interventions.</li> </ol> <b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Methodology:</b> While the abstract mentions that 120 respondents were surveyed, it could briefly specify the ex-post facto design or the inclusion of diverse stakeholder groups.</li> <li><b>Broader Impact:</b> The abstract could explicitly mention how the findings contribute to the field of agricultural economics or policy-making on a national scale.</li> <li><b>Conciseness:</b> Some details about specific findings (e.g., exact percentages of knowledge levels) could be omitted to keep the abstract focused on broader themes.</li> </ol>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound, as it follows established research methodologies, provides detailed findings, and discusses their implications in the context of agricultural market transformations through the e-NAM platform. However, based on the content, the following aspects should be carefully considered to confirm its scientific rigor:	

**Review Form 3**

	<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Clear Objectives:</b> The manuscript defines a well-scoped research problem, focusing on knowledge gaps in e-NAM adoption in a specific region.</li> <li><b>Methodology:</b> The use of an ex-post facto design and inclusion of diverse stakeholders (farmers, traders, commission agents, and market officials) strengthens the validity of the study.</li> <li><b>Data Analysis:</b> Findings are supported by statistical analysis (e.g., correlation coefficients), ensuring reliability.</li> <li><b>Actionable Recommendations:</b> The proposed solutions, such as capacity-building programs and digital tools, align with the study's findings and are feasible.</li> </ol> <p><b>Points to Verify/Consider:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Sampling Details:</b> While the sampling appears appropriate, it should be confirmed that the sample size (120 respondents) is representative enough for generalizations about the region.</li> <li><b>Citations and References:</b> The manuscript cites relevant studies and aligns findings with existing literature, but the currency and scope of references should be checked to ensure they represent the latest research.</li> <li><b>Limitations:</b> While the manuscript implicitly acknowledges challenges (e.g., infrastructure barriers), an explicit section discussing limitations and potential biases (e.g., sampling bias or regional focus) would enhance transparency.</li> <li><b>Scientific Accuracy of Correlations:</b> The positive correlations between factors like education, digital literacy, and e-NAM knowledge are logical, but further validation through regression models or other robust statistical techniques could strengthen the analysis.</li> <li><b>Generalizability:</b> Since the study focuses on Nizamabad district, clarifying how findings might apply to other regions or agricultural contexts would enhance the study's broader relevance.</li> </ol> <p><b>Final Assessment:</b> The manuscript is scientifically correct and well-structured, adhering to academic standards in its field. However, minor refinements, particularly in discussing limitations and ensuring the robustness of statistical analyses, would further validate its findings and conclusions.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are relevant and support the study's findings effectively. However, there are some aspects to consider for improving the sufficiency and recency of the references:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Relevance:</b> The references cited, such as studies on e-NAM adoption, digital literacy, and agricultural marketing, are well-aligned with the manuscript's focus.</li> <li><b>Foundational Sources:</b> Key foundational works (e.g., on e-NAM implementation and agricultural policies) are included, providing a strong theoretical base.</li> </ol> <p><b>Areas for Improvement:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Recency:</b> While many references are recent (2020–2023), some older studies (e.g., Gopinath, 2005; Ganesan &amp; Seetha Lakshmi, 2002) could be supplemented with updated research on similar topics to ensure relevance in the current digital landscape.</li> <li><b>Global Context:</b> Including references that compare India's e-NAM with international digital agricultural marketplaces could provide a broader perspective.</li> <li><b>Technological Insights:</b> Studies focusing on advancements in digital tools for agricultural markets, particularly mobile applications and blockchain, could enrich the manuscript.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are a few areas where improvements could enhance readability and professionalism:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Clarity:</b> The article conveys its objectives, methodology, and findings effectively. The core ideas are easy to follow.</li> <li><b>Scholarly Tone:</b> The language maintains a formal tone, appropriate for academic writing.</li> </ol> <p><b>Areas for Improvement:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Grammar and Syntax:</b> A few sentences could be restructured for smoother readability. For instance, certain phrases are overly lengthy or repetitive.</li> <li><b>Consistency:</b> There is some inconsistency in the use of tenses and terms (e.g., switching between past and present tense unnecessarily). Maintaining a uniform tense throughout sections like the methodology and results would improve coherence.</li> <li><b>Technical Terms:</b> Some technical terms (e.g., "ex-post facto design") could be briefly explained for interdisciplinary readers who may not be familiar with them.</li> <li><b>Flow and Transitions:</b> Linking sentences and paragraphs with stronger transitional phrases could make the text flow more seamlessly.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Here are some general comments and suggestions for improving the manuscript, organized under relevant sub-headings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Title and Abstract <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The title is clear but could be made more concise and engaging. A suggested alternative is: "Bridging Knowledge Gaps in e-NAM Adoption: A Study in Nizamabad District, Telangana."</li> <li>• The abstract is comprehensive but can be streamlined by omitting detailed statistics and focusing on broader themes, such as the implications of findings on policy and practice.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The introduction provides a good background on e-NAM and its significance. However, incorporating a brief mention of how this study contributes to the existing literature would clarify its unique value.</li> <li>• Adding a clear problem statement, such as the specific challenges faced by farmers in Nizamabad district regarding e-NAM adoption, would strengthen the narrative.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The methodology section is detailed, but it could benefit from a brief explanation of why an ex-post facto design was chosen.</li> <li>• Including a flow diagram or table summarizing the steps taken during the study (e.g., sampling, data collection, analysis) would make the section more reader-friendly.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Results and Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the results are presented systematically, linking them more explicitly to the study's objectives would enhance their relevance.</li> <li>• The discussion could delve deeper into comparing findings with existing studies, highlighting similarities and differences to reinforce the study's contribution to the field.</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conclusion effectively summarizes key findings and recommendations but could briefly touch on future research directions. For example, suggest exploring e-NAM adoption in other regions or integrating advanced technologies like AI and blockchain in agricultural markets.</li> </ul> </li> <li>6. References <p>The references are adequate but could include more recent studies and international perspectives to enrich the discussion.</p> </li> <li>7. Language and Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The language is suitable but would benefit from minor edits to correct grammatical errors and improve sentence structure.</li> <li>• Consider breaking long paragraphs into smaller sections with sub-headings for better readability, particularly in the methodology and discussion sections.</li> </ul> </li> <li>8. Visual Aids <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including more visuals, such as charts or graphs summarizing the data, would enhance comprehension and engagement.</li> <li>• A map of Nizamabad district highlighting the agricultural hubs could provide geographical context.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>General Comments</b> Overall, the manuscript is a valuable contribution to understanding e-NAM adoption in a critical agricultural region. With minor revisions to improve clarity, coherence, and presentation, it will be well-positioned for publication in a scholarly journal.</p>	
---	---	--

**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>Dilip Kumar Darjee</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Indira Gandhi National Open University, India</b>