

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_126324
Title of the Manuscript:	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROFILE CHARACTERISTICS AND KNOWLEDGE LEVEL OF FARMERS ABOUT PRADHAN MANTRI FASAL BIMA YOJANA SCHEME IN CUDDALORE DISTRICT OF TAMILNADU
Type of the Article	Original 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The manuscript is important to know the significance of the PMFBY, whether the people are aware of the scheme and how many among them are availing the scheme to the grassroot level.	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically correct as it contains all the subsections including abstract, introduction, methodology, results and discussion, conclusion and references in an appropriate way with justified literature.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes the references cited are sufficient and recent but the author need to follow the format of the journal to cite references as the references are not in the same format.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes the language is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Overall the Manuscript could be accepted for publication with minor corrections.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nitu Kumari
Department, University & Country	Bihar Agricultural University, India