

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_83671
Title of the Manuscript:	Attitude of farmers on Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana in Tumkur district of Karnataka
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The article titled "Attitude of farmers on Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana in Tumkur district of Karnataka" seems to be an original research-based article. After a careful review of the paper, the following comments/recommendations have been made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract does not say what the study is about and why was it done. It looks like the summary of the paper instead. 2. Since the study was based on the <i>fasal bima yojna</i>, there is a need to discuss in detail about this insurance scheme. 3. Further, there is a need to discuss the nature and extent of implementation and awareness building mechanisms about the <i>yojna</i> in the studied area. All these will help build the context of the study without which the paper seems incomplete or unable to give a meaningful accounts and findings. 4. The researcher has mentioned that several Independent variables were used in the study. However, the paper does not talk about them. There is a need to describe these variables and the rationale for selecting them. The nature of the variables seems to be conceptual or value-laden. Thus, there is a need to describe the process of deconstructing the variables while making them empirically observable or measurable. It is also necessary to describe what questions were asked to get the answer that helped empirical assessment of the variables. 5. The respondents' profile characteristics must be defined adequately, especially for characters like "middle age group", "medium farmers", "medium farming experience", "medium annual income", "cosmopolitaness" (high, middle low), "medium extension contact", "medium extension participation", "medium social participation", "medium achievement motivation", "medium scientific orientation", "medium level of risk orientations" etc. 6. The explanation under the heading "Attitude level of respondents of PMFBY" seems to be a recommendation, not an analysis. Here, the only cause-effect relationship should have been discussed instead of commenting on what should be done or should have been done. 7. The conclusion is very brief and lacks clarity, and lack necessary discussion. The last sentence is somewhat misleading. 8. If the author revises the paper based on these points, it will be a meaningful and scientifically valid article. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	C.J. Sonowal
Department, University & Country	International Institute for Population Sciences, India