

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_85345
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON FARMERS' PERCEPTION ON SOIL HEALTH CARD IN RANGAREDDY DISTRICT OF TELANGANA STATE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Referencing should improve to make it more focused on the international literature, and a definition of 'soils health' should be included.The description of the set-up of the study is insufficiently clear. In particular the relation between the two sets of 60 and 120 farmers should be clarified.In the chi-square test there is a column with C-value: it is unclear why that column is included and what the meaning of the C-value is.Interpretation of table 2 should improve and for instance include explanations why particular variables are significant (or not).A discussion section addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the study should be added, as well as sketching opportunities for future research	I am thankful for your needful corrections and cooperation from your busy schedule. Once again thank you for your valuable time on sharing comments.
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The English would benefit from a careful editing by a native English speaking scientist.The word 'per cent' should be replaced by the symbol '%' throughout. Also, the number of significant digits should be brought back to three (for instance 95% instead of 94.99 %).Section 3 is somewhat boring to read – possibly the authors can use their creative skills to make it somewhat more interesting.	I am thankful for your needful corrections and cooperation from your busy schedule. Once again thank you for your valuable time on sharing comments.
Optional/General comments	None	

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)	Nil