

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_129266
Title of the Manuscript:	INTERRELATIONSHIP OF FARMER'S KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE IN FERTILIZER APPLICATION ON BORO RICE PRODUCTION IN SUNAMGANJ DISTRICT OF BANGLADESH: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW AND KEY INDICATORS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH
Type of the Article	Review 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>

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.	A literature review is important kind of study to know the present scenario of the phenomenon and also what can be future research areas and gaps that can be studied, which in turn also guides the scientific community, giving them direction and ease their work if it's done properly. Author has clearly mentioned the importance of topic.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I find the title too long. The title should be concise. I suggest "A Literature Review on interrelationship of farmer's knowledge and attitude in fertilizer application on boro rice production in Bangladesh". I think mention of sunamganj district can be done as the study area as the author has not once mentioned the district in the abstract but rather 'Bangladesh' only in the abstract.	
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.	This abstract needs correction as it does not include the key findings but just introduce the topic, it's importance and its goals. The abstract should be self-contained providing all key information about the manuscript. Add the key findings, key recommendations etc to make it self-contained so that readers can decide whether to read the whole manuscript or not after reading the abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	I do not approve the way it is written. The correct way of writing a review paper is not followed. Many sections of the paper are rather devoid of important information. No novel interpretations and conclusions are given after doing a review. Not a rigorous scientific review.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, but some references are very old. See if it is possible to replace them with newer ones.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, English is simple, easy to understand.	
Optional/General comments	Some grammatical mistakes and other mistakes were there. I have added comments in the manuscript. Please make the required corrections.	

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:	Disha Agarwal
Department, University & Country	G. B. Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, India