Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEBA_126190**
Title of the Manuscript:	**FACTORS INFLUENCE THE ADOPTION OF IMPROVED AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES AMONG SMALLHOLDER FARMERS IN THE RIPAT PROGRAM.**
Type of the Article	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

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It discusses about adoption of improved agricultural practices among marginal farmers such as fertilizer use and intercropping methods. I like the area it tries to tap in but from a research point of view, this piece requires tons of improvements, some are already highlighted from my side and some are left intentionally for the author to find. So that they can get time to find more scope for improvements.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	Yes.	
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.	1. No, many typing errors such as, "such fertilizer use and intercropping method". Here author forget to add "as". 2. Please use proper scientific language and avoid such language "A study was carried out using". 3. Grammatical errors " Findings reveals ".	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	1. Proper space is not provided "(URT,2020)". 2. The literature review section is missing. 3. Please use proper scientific language "Figure 1. Showing the study area".	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Currently, I am 60% sure about the scientific correctness of the manuscript based on my first reading. But at the same time, i am scared to see the level of errors in the final draft submitted by the authors.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	No, it still requires improvements in formatting such as URT is not defined anywhere and also not properly formatted like other references, i also found same issue with some other references as well.	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Language quality is poor.	
Optional/General 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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Udit Maheshwari**
Department, University & Country	**IIMA, India**