

Review Form 1.7

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

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	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. 2. Is the title of the article suitable? The title is appropriate for the manuscript as presented. 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. 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. 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. 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.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ezekiel Kemboi
Department, University & Country	Center for Advanced Studies in Environmental Law and Policy, University of Nairobi, Kenya