

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Referencing should improve to make it more focused on the international literature, and a definition of 'soils health' should be included.</li><li>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.</li><li>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.</li><li>Interpretation of table 2 should improve and for instance include explanations why particular variables are significant (or not).</li><li>A discussion section addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the study should be added, as well as sketching opportunities for future research</li></ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The English would benefit from a careful editing by a native English speaking scientist.</li><li>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% in stead of 94.99 %).</li><li>Section 3 is somewhat boring to read – possibly the authors can use their creative skills to make it somewhat more interesting.</li></ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alfred Stein
Department, University & Country	University of Twente, Netherlands