

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_129393
Title of the Manuscript:	“KVK-Led Initiatives and their Effect on the Knowledge and Adoption of Improved Chickpea Cultivar JAKI-9218”
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>
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 work improves the knowledge of how a research institute can positively impact on a farming community. Approaches of IPM practices and knowledge transfer can improve productivity and can be understood by the farmer through a multiple option. Some scientific researches fail to be adopted because of the marginal ability to acquire inputs	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	“KVK Institute-Led Initiatives and their Effect on the Knowledge and Adoption of Improved JAKI-9218 Chickpea Cultivar”	
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English has minimum corrections to be adopted, the case of tolerate instead of resistance of a pest	
Optional/General comments	<p>CFLDs has not been defined earlier before being used</p> <p>While discussing results in a table, I would suggest items be in a chronological format as in the table, e.g., Report in chronological order: land preparation, 100%, variety, 100%, season of sowing, 100%, etc.</p> <p>The use of three fourth instead of three-quarters is a challenge to the readability</p> <p>The sentence “It might be due to the fact that the majority of the farmers were middle-aged, literate and had medium to high experience in Chickpea cultivation”. Should have a foundation Grammatical error cases are many, “Further, high economic motivation and medium extension participation and scientific orientation of farmers might have influenced them to had medium to high level of knowledge about the recommended cultivation practices of Chickpea.” The sentence need improvement;</p> <p>“The reasons for non adoption of above practices might be due to lack of knowledge, high cost and non availability of fertilizers and usually it is the tendency of farmers to follow the fertilizer and chemical dose as suggested by the fertilizer and input dealers and other farmer friends”.</p> <p>Numbering in table 5 should be improved</p> <p>There is lack of forming consistence in” higher net returns of Rs.51165/ ha over farmers practice which was Rs.44, 325 / ha and B:C ratio “ is not there</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Wanjala Wanyonyi Nasirembe
Department, University & Country	Agricultural Mechanization Research Institute-Katumani, Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization, Kenya