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| PART 1: Review Comments | | |
| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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.** | This manuscript highlights an important issue in agricultural practices, specifically the knowledge and attitudes of farmers regarding soil testing in Chittorgarh, Rajasthan. It underscores the knowledge gap among farmers about effective soil sampling techniques, which is crucial for optimizing crop production and reducing unnecessary fertilizer use. The study's findings that 76% of farmers disagreed with the idea that soil testing is a waste of time and that 72% agreed on its necessity for better crop production reflect a positive shift in attitudes. This paper is valuable as it emphasizes the need for targeted educational initiatives to promote soil testing, which could lead to better agricultural practices and environmental sustainability in the region. The manuscript makes a strong case for intervention from agricultural departments and institutions like Krishi Vigyan Kendras (KVKs) to provide training and support for farmers, thus offering actionable insights for agricultural development. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title, *"Knowledge and Attitude of Farmers Regarding Soil Testing in Chittorgarh (Rajasthan),"* is descriptive and gives a clear indication of the study’s scope. However, it could be improved to emphasize the importance of soil testing in sustainable agricultural practices and address the regional context. |  |
| 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. | The abstract of the article provides a basic overview, focusing on the study's location, participants, and key findings about farmers' knowledge gaps and positive attitudes toward soil testing. However, it could be made more comprehensive by including additional elements that would give readers a clearer, holistic view of the study. I would like to make some specific suggestions for improvement as listed below:-   1. Add Objective and Context: Briefly state the purpose of the study (i.e., to evaluate the knowledge and attitudes of farmers regarding soil testing practices and its role in sustainable agriculture) and mention why soil testing is critical for agricultural productivity and environmental health. 2. Methodology Summary: While the abstract mentions the study location and sampling, it could benefit from a concise mention of the methodology, such as the data collection approach (e.g., personal interviews) and key topics covered in the survey. 3. Detailed Findings: While the abstract indicates a knowledge gap, it should specify the most significant areas of deficiency (e.g., sampling techniques) and highlight any contrasting attitudes toward soil testing reliability or cost-effectiveness. 4. Implications and Recommendations: Mention the broader implications of the study, including how improving soil testing awareness could impact fertilizer usage, crop yield, and environmental sustainability. Recommendations for agricultural agencies to conduct training or educational programs could also be included here. 5. Remove Repetitive Points: Eliminate any repetitive statements about positive attitudes or knowledge gaps that don’t add additional insight.   Incorporating these suggestions would make the abstract more comprehensive, allowing readers to quickly grasp the study's purpose, methods, main findings, and practical implications. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | The structure of the manuscript appears generally appropriate, covering key sections such as the introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion, which are essential for a research study. However, there are areas where the structure could be enhanced for clarity and flow. I would like to make some specific suggestions for improvement as listed below:-   1. Introduction: The introduction effectively sets the stage by discussing the importance of soil testing. It could benefit from a clear, separate subsection outlining the study's objectives. This would help readers immediately understand the research goals and the context of the study. 2. Methodology: This section describes the study location, sample size, and data collection method, but it would be helpful to have subsections such as *Study Area*, *Sampling*, and *Data Collection*. This would improve clarity, especially for readers interested in replicating or building on the study. 3. Results and Discussion: Currently, the results and discussion sections are somewhat combined, which may limit the depth of analysis. Separating these into distinct *Results* and *Discussion* sections would allow the results to be presented objectively, followed by an in-depth discussion that contextualizes findings within existing literature. Subheadings within the results (e.g., *Knowledge Gaps*, *Attitudes Toward Soil Testing*) would also make the content more accessible. 4. Conclusion and Recommendations: The conclusion provides a good summary, but a separate *Recommendations* subsection would be helpful. This subsection could emphasize actionable steps for policymakers, extension services, or local agencies, aligning the recommendations more directly with the study's findings. 5. Tables and Figures: If there are tables or figures in the results, each should be introduced within the text for smoother integration and context. Ensure they are labeled clearly to aid reader comprehension.   By organizing the manuscript with these more defined subsections, the manuscript's readability, coherence, and overall scientific rigor would be enhanced. |  |
| **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 demonstrates scientific correctness and robustness by employing a well-defined methodology and a systematic approach to data collection. It uses a random sampling method across ten villages, providing a balanced representation of farmers in Chittorgarh, Rajasthan. The study addresses relevant issues—such as the knowledge gap in soil testing techniques and farmers’ attitudes toward soil testing—with quantitative data that supports its findings, making the conclusions credible and relevant. Additionally, the manuscript references previous research, which strengthens its foundation and aligns the findings with established literature on agricultural practices and soil management. This adherence to scientific methodology and alignment with existing research contributes to the manuscript's technical soundness. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | The references in the manuscript cover foundational studies on soil testing and farmers’ adoption of agricultural practices, providing a solid background for the research. However, most references appear to be from earlier studies, with few recent publications. To strengthen the manuscript's relevance and reflect current practices in soil health and sustainable agriculture, incorporating more recent references would be beneficial. Accordingly, I would recommend some suggestions for additional, recent references that could enhance the manuscript:-   1. Recent studies on soil testing and nutrient management: Look for studies published in the last five years that examine innovations in soil health assessment, nutrient management, or the effectiveness of soil health cards in improving agricultural outcomes. These could provide up-to-date insights and potentially support the manuscript's conclusions. 2. Research on farmer adoption of sustainable practices: Including newer research on factors influencing farmers' adoption of sustainable or precision agriculture practices could provide a broader context for the study's findings on attitudes and knowledge gaps. 3. Policy-focused studies on agricultural extension services: Given that the manuscript emphasizes the role of educational interventions, references to recent studies on the impact of agricultural extension programs could substantiate the recommendations section and highlight effective strategies for improving farmer knowledge.   Including recent references in these areas would not only strengthen the manuscript’s credibility but also position it within the context of current agricultural challenges and solutions. |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language of the article is clear and understandable; however, it would benefit from some improvements to meet the standards of scholarly communication. There are minor grammatical issues, repetitive phrasing, and occasional awkward sentence structures that could be revised for conciseness and readability. Accordingly, I would recommend some suggestions for additional, recent references that could enhance the manuscript:-   1. **Clarity and Precision**: Some sentences could be rephrased to enhance clarity, especially in sections explaining the methodology and results. For instance, clearly distinguishing between terms like "knowledge gap" and "attitude" would improve reader comprehension. 2. **Grammar and Syntax**: There are minor grammatical errors and syntactical inconsistencies that could be corrected to improve flow. For example, avoid starting sentences with conjunctions like "And" or "But" in formal writing. 3. **Conciseness**: Some statements in the introduction and conclusion are repetitive, such as reiterating the positive attitudes toward soil testing. Streamlining these sections would make the text more concise and impactful. 4. **Scholarly Tone**: To enhance the scholarly tone, consider rephrasing informal expressions. For example, replace phrases like "maximum knowledge gap was observed" with more precise language such as "a significant knowledge gap was identified."   A thorough language review would make the manuscript more polished and suitable for scholarly publication. |  |
| Optional/General comments | The manuscript addresses an important and timely topic in agricultural sustainability by focusing on soil testing knowledge and attitudes among farmers, a foundational aspect for improving crop productivity and environmental health. The study offers valuable insights, particularly regarding the need for targeted educational programs to bridge knowledge gaps and promote effective soil management practices. However, a few general improvements could enhance the manuscript’s quality and impact:   1. **Enhanced Focus on Practical Implications**: While the study highlights knowledge gaps and attitudes, emphasizing actionable recommendations for policymakers and agricultural extension services would increase the manuscript’s relevance. This could include specific strategies for training programs or campaigns that could help farmers adopt better soil testing practices. 2. **Improvement of Visual Data Presentation**: The inclusion of well-labeled tables or figures would make the data more accessible and visually engaging for readers, especially if these illustrate key knowledge gaps or attitude distributions. 3. **Clarity in Methodology**: Adding a brief explanation of the sampling method’s rationale, along with specific details on how data was analyzed, would strengthen the study’s methodological transparency and replicability. 4. **Updating References**: Including more recent studies would bring the research up to date, making it more relevant to contemporary discussions on sustainable agricultural practices.   Overall, this manuscript provides a meaningful contribution to agricultural research, and with these improvements, it would be even better suited for scholarly publication.  The manuscript does not appear to have any obvious ethical issues; however, there are a few aspects that should be clarified to ensure adherence to ethical research standards:-   1. **Informed Consent**: It is important to confirm that informed consent was obtained from the farmer participants, especially since data was collected through personal interviews. A brief statement on consent in the methodology section would strengthen the manuscript's ethical transparency. 2. **Confidentiality and Anonymity**: The manuscript should mention any measures taken to protect the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants, even if no personal identifiers were collected.   Addressing these ethical considerations would enhance the manuscript’s credibility and assure readers of its compliance with ethical research practices. |  |
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