

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_130086
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Frontline Demonstrations on Productivity and Economics of Wheat (Triticum Aestivum L.) in Sonipat District of Haryana, India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
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.	This manuscript provides critical insights into the role of frontline demonstrations (FLDs) in enhancing wheat productivity and economic returns, particularly in the context of Sonipat district, Haryana, India. By evaluating the effectiveness of improved agronomic practices and technologies disseminated through FLDs, the study highlights their potential to bridge yield gaps and promote sustainable wheat production. The findings offer valuable evidence to policymakers, researchers, and extension professionals aiming to optimize resource use and improve farmer livelihoods. Additionally, the manuscript contributes to the broader understanding of region-specific agricultural interventions, serving as a model for similar agro-climatic zones.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable for the article.	
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.	The abstract is very well written showing the summarised results with the outcome of research work.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically written.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is suitable for scholarly communication. The article is written in simple English without grammatical errors.	
Optional/General comments	No further comments.	

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:	Himalay R. Patel
Department, University & Country	Marwadi University, Rajkot, Gujarat, India