

## Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_128555
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact assessment of the KVK cluster frontline demonstrations on productivity of Mustard crop: A Study in Jammu Region of Jammu and Kashmir (J&K).
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>	The manuscript investigates the impact of Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) cluster frontline demonstrations (FLDs) on mustard crop productivity in Jammu and Kashmir. The study highlights the effectiveness of FLDs in increasing yields, improving resource management, and adopting modern agricultural practices. The research is timely, relevant to agricultural extension services, and provides practical insights for policymakers.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Impact Assessment of the KVK Cluster Frontline Demonstrations on Productivity of Mustard Crop: Insights from Jammu and Kashmir	
<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>	It provides a comprehensive summary but could be more concise. Consider reducing repetition and focusing on key findings and implications.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The topic is significant, focusing on increasing agricultural productivity and improving livelihoods in a key oilseed-producing region. The use of a multi-stage random sampling technique and an ex-post facto design is appropriate for the study objectives. Comparisons between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries provide a clear evaluation of FLD impacts. The manuscript employs statistical tools effectively to demonstrate significant differences in productivity, adoption rates, and farming practices between groups. The tables are well-structured and convey results effectively. Quantitative evidence strengthens the arguments presented.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Most of the cited works, such as those by Rogers (2003) and Kothari (2004), are older foundational texts, which is acceptable for methodological and theoretical underpinnings but less ideal for demonstrating cutting-edge research or the latest findings. The references range from 2003 to 2021. Only two references are from 2021	

## Review Form 3

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>There are grammatical errors and instances of awkward phrasing, such as in the conclusion section: "In the light of said findings and discussions of the present study, the following conclusions can be draw." These should be revised for clarity and precision.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The introduction is informative but lacks a clear articulation of the research gap. The study would benefit from a more explicit discussion of the limitations of previous studies and how the current research addresses them. The manuscript lacks a dedicated section for reviewing past studies. Incorporating a structured literature review would provide a better context for the research and strengthen its foundation. The discussion does not delve deeply into the implications of the findings. A comparison with similar studies from other regions or crops could enhance the generalizability of the conclusions.</p> <p>While the statistical findings are robust, the manuscript could benefit from additional qualitative insights, such as direct quotes from farmer interviews, to enrich the narrative. The tables are informative but could be accompanied by visual aids, such as charts, to make the data more accessible. The conclusion could emphasize actionable recommendations for stakeholders, such as policy adjustments or additional training for farmers.</p> <p>Revise the introduction to include a clear statement of the research gap and objectives. Add a literature review section to contextualize the study within existing research. Strengthen the discussion by comparing findings with other studies and exploring their broader implications.</p> <p>Need to include implications, originality, limitations, and future research agenda.</p>	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Shawan Uddin</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh</b></p>