

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_88105
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmers' Attitude and Preference towards Crop Diversification with Maize in Haryana
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>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Line 18: Unstandardized abbreviations like 'MSP' should not be included in the abstract. MSP must be written in full.-Again, why does the author use several 'quotation marks' in the abstract?-The main aim or specific objectives, coupled with the study's methodology/approach for data analysis and data collection are missing. The abstract is the engine of the work, hence, must coax readers into reading further by summing up the paper. I humbly suggest authors to include these details in the in initial part of the abstract.-Do authors mean to say invasion or declension? Kindly check if the suggested word is appropriate in this context. Does the author wish to say invasion of armyworms on maize in this context? <p>Research Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-How did the author arrive at this sample size? Is there any justification?-How representative is this number in generalizing findings for farmers in the study area?-What are the study's limitations or challenges?-How was bias judgements or responses from the farmers dealt with, considering the subjectivity of the method used? <p>Lines 98-99: What software or statistical tools were used to analyse data collected?</p> <p>-Here, the author must state specifically the version of the software used (E.g., SPSS IBM version 22 or Excel Statistical package v.16, Chicago, USA)</p> <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Line 105: 60% does not constitute two-thirds. Authors could use close to... or majority of ...-Lines 158-166: Though factors in quotation marks are linked to farmers' perception, it is inappropriate and ambiguous to present them in a way it is currently presented. Authors need to remove the quotation marks and use the right punctuations like full top (.) and colons (:) or semi-colons to present the same idea.-The highlighted sections are lengthy, difficult to read and misleading or unclear.-Again, authors could have rephrased sentences to connote the same idea without repasting same details in the table. <p>Lines 167-177: Same here. Kindly remove all the quotation marks and use the appropriate punctuations to ensure brevity and clarity/conciseness.</p> <p>Line 172: Do authors mean to say invasion of armyworms on maize? Kindly check and use the appropriate word to suit the context if the suggested word misconstrues the sentence.</p> <p>Lines 179-199: Same here.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-No proper discussion was done, in relation to explaining what the results mean. Details provided in the tables were rephrased in words.-Authors need to compare the results of this study against existing literature in the region or elsewhere across the globe (i.e., studies with similar scope as the present study). <p>Which aspects tally/agree or refute existing literature?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-What policies or mechanisms/strategies somewhat drive or influence farmers' perception on diversification and preferences?-Is there a correlation between their educational status, duration or length/duration on farming experience, against their level of knowledge on crop diversification and preferences? These parameters need to be clearly discussed. <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-The conclusion must entail the main aim of the study or highlight what the study sought to address, summary of the main findings in bulletin and not in quotation marks, importance to the study findings to industrial players and policy-makers/researchers, as well as limitation of the study or possible areas for further research.-There are major grammatical defects and syntax errors that need to be corrected or revised. Authors need to rephrase sentences in their own words, explaining	

Review Form 1.6

	them without repeating details or results presented in tables by placing them in quotation marks.	
Minor REVISION comments	-Major grammatical defects and syntax errors were identified and corrected. Authors need to check the manuscript thoroughly or seek for the assistance of someone with command in English to revise sections highlighted for their urgent attention.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is generally informative and could support basic research datasets at the local level. However, there are substantial or major issues that need to be address in order to improve the paper's robustness, structure and proficiency for acceptance or publication.	

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:	Isaac Sarfo
Department, University & Country	Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, China