

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_83670
Title of the Manuscript:	A study on farmers knowledge 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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>Abstract section needs improvement. Especially the paragraph “About sixteen independent variables were selected based on judges' relevancy rating and were quantified using measurement devices. The data were collected using a pretested structured interview schedule and suitable statistical tools were used to analyze the data”. It is vague to state measurement devices and suitable statistical tools. Needs to be more specific.</p> <p>Accordingly, in the Methodology section, needs to be stated what are the measurement devices and the suitable statistical tools that were used in the analysis. Consequently, the methodology section lacks major justification and no references are stated in this.</p> <p>Additionally, Introduction section lacks major justification and no references are stated in this in order to justify those that are mentioned in the introduction.</p> <p>Results & Discussion section needs major improvement in terms of the presentation of the results. Especially the paragraph regarding “Profile characteristics of farmer beneficiaries of PMFBY” it is not stated that those that are mentioned as results, are corresponded in Table 1. Furthermore, Figure 1 is in contrast with Table 2.</p> <p>Finally, conclusion section needs improvement, is very limited. Accordingly, more references are needed to justify Introduction and Methodology sections.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The current study aims to investigate the relationship between the profile characteristics of farmer beneficiaries and their knowledge on PMFBY in Tumkur district of Karnataka. I find the problem under examination interesting. The study also addresses the issue for examination, and presents clearly its aims and objectives.</p> <p>However, Introduction section does not provide a literature review of relevant publications. Additionally, the methodology, results and consequently conclusion sections represent major weaknesses and need improvement in terms of both justifications by providing more references but also in terms of the presentation especially regarding the results section. More comments based on that are provided analytically in <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments section.</p>	

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:	Eleni Kaimakoudi
Department, University & Country	Agricultural Economics Research Institute, Greece