

Editor's Comment:

I have gone through the revised manuscript and the review comments of the reviewers. Following are the actions i have taken or wish you to take:

1. There were several grammatical and expression mistakes in the revised article. I have corrected them as far as possible. You can see them using the track change option in the revised manuscript attached.
2. The title has a problem, which I have pointed out in the comment on the text.
3. The author must inform the reader about the nature and extent of termites' activities in the studied area. How far are the farmers influenced positively or negatively by the termites' actions? It is logical to think that if termites significantly impact the soil quality, the farmers must have developed a symbiotic relationship with them since farming is a traditional and century-old practice among these people. The present investigation finds its ground in such a context. If the context is left uncovered as to why the issue of termites' beneficial action has to be assessed according to the farmer's perception, the basic premise of the research or the inquiry will be illogical and irrational.
4. The methodology reveals that the researcher did not visit the study sites personally. So, the contexts of the field are not mentioned in the article, which is one of the shortcomings of the inquiry. The methodology thus could not be precise because the problem setting was not properly identified or delineated. It seems that the researcher came up with an idea and sent the questionnaires to the selected respondents without knowing whether there was a significant presence of termites in the farmland or not. It is natural that if the farmers do not notice the significant presence of termites in their fields, their knowledge or ideas about the ill effects or good effects will be imaginary and perceptual, not based on significant practical situations. This implies the importance of describing the study's context or problem settings in relation to the field situations.

So, I suggest that if the researcher knows the significant presence of termites in the fields of the farmers under study, he/she must discuss it in the introduction to set the problem setting or the research argument.

My Decision:

If we do not seek a deeper understanding of the issue but simply examine the types of data collected and assess them based on those data, the manuscript may be published as such.

However, as I mentioned above, it will not be a scientific study since a crucial component of research has been left out. In my view, the author should be advised to incorporate the information I have mentioned above and revise the article on that basis and make it comprehensive and meaningful to the readers and researchers.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Chandra Jyoti Sonowal
Assistant Professor, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, India.