

Review Form 1.7

1

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_111292
Title of the Manuscript:	Cultivating Adaptation: A Study of FPO Farmer Preferences for Climate-Smart Training in the Western zone of Tamil Nadu
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) The manuscript is a lucid presentation of various considerations involved in the design training programs.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? The title is appropriate for the manuscript as presented.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? While the abstract is okay it fails to adequately highlight the results since it has overemphasized methodological approaches and considerations.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The sections and structure are appropriate except that in some discussions ought to form the concluding paragraph. The introduction and the review of the study should be merged into one section named introduction rather than separation as currently presented.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? I find the manuscript okay although no sampling criteria has been demonstrated as to how the relevant statistics were arrived at.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. The references are okay as presented it has a balanced of the dated and current literature in the last two decades.</p>	<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>Yes,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application of conjoint analysis in farmer training evaluation: This could be valuable for researchers, as conjoint analysis has rarely been used in this context.</li> <li>Rank-based quotient (RBQ) for analyzing farmers' motivations: This could offer a new tool for understanding farmer decision-making, contributing to agricultural and extension psychology research.</li> <li>Evidence-based recommendations for training frequency and duration: The study provides concrete suggestions for training centers to optimize their programs based on farmers' preferences.</li> </ul> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? Yes. The title is appropriate for the manuscript as presented.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Abstract refined and enriched with comprehensive research paper context."</li> </ul> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? "Yes, the integrated introduction and review structure is a good choice. It provides a clear overview of the existing research on farmer training preferences, while also smoothly transitioning into your own study's specific focus on FPO farmers in the Western zone."</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes. The relevant data collection methods were given elaborately now.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. Yes the references are sufficient.</p>
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	Whereas the author states that in conjoint studies include personal interviews, expert judgment, group interviews, or computerized methods; and that the personal interview method was selected to identify the relevant attributes and attribute level; the author has not demonstrated how the statistics were arrived at. This is a weakness of the manuscript since the data collection used qualitative methods, however the outcomes are quantitative results.	Section 2.2.2 ("Experiment Design") meticulously outlined the process of transforming qualitative attributes into quantifiable data for analysis. The resulting models, derived from the orthogonal design, were then directly presented to respondents. Each respondent expressed their relative preference for each model based on their individual priorities. The underlying conjoint analysis assumed a linear relationship between the perceived utility (satisfaction) and each attribute level, as represented by the equation.
---------------------------	--	---

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)	This paper is not published anywhere.