

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_130297
Title of the Manuscript:	A correlation analysis and socio-economic attributes among maize growers of Surguja district of Chhattisgarh
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript presents an analysis of the socio-economic characteristics and agricultural methods used by maize farmers in the Surguja area of Chhattisgarh, India. The study identifies challenges like the slow uptake of cutting-edge technologies as well as important variables affecting maize farming, including landholding, income, and education. Designing focused agricultural interventions and policies to improve maize farming's sustainability and productivity requires such knowledge. The results also offer a starting point for further studies on optimizing the socioeconomic and agronomic elements of maize production in comparable agro-climatic zones.	Incorporated under the introduction of manuscript
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, “ <i>A correlation analysis and socio-economic attributes among maize growers of Surguja district of Chhattisgarh,</i> ” is somewhat descriptive but could be more succinct and appealing. Suggested alternative title: “Socio-Economic Attributes and Correlation Analysis of Maize Growers in Surguja District, Chhattisgarh”.	Corrected as suggested title : “ Socio-Economic Profiles of Maize Growers in Surguja District, Chhattisgarh ”

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is somewhat detailed but lacks focus and coherence. However, the following suggestions can be used for enhancement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Consolidate redundant points, such as descriptions of socio-economic characteristics, into concise summaries.b) Highlight the key findings, such as the factors significantly correlated with the adoption of maize production technology.c) Avoid overloading the abstract with percentages and statistics; instead, present general trends and their implications.	<p>Incorporated as suggested under manuscript.</p>
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript is generally not well structured and presented as a standard scientific manuscript. However, it can be improved through major revisions particularly considering the following suggestions:</p> <p>Introduction section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The current introduction is somewhat informative but could benefit from a clearer structure and flow.• The introduction misses a clear research objective statement. <p>Suggestions for revisions could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Start with a broader context about maize's role in Indian agriculture and its significance for the region.• Introduce specific research gaps the study addresses.• Add a concluding sentence clearly stating the study's objectives. <p>Materials and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The description of the methodology is adequate but could be clearer.• Missing details about the structured interview schedule (e.g., was it pre-tested?).• Details on the sample size selection (i.e., providing reasons why the sample size of 120 respondents is considered an adequate representation of the farmers in the studied area. Justification of the methodology for selection is also needed for clarity and validity of the findings and the derived conclusion and recommendations. <p>Revision Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Specify the rationale for selecting the eight villages and the random sampling method.• Provide more detail about how variables were measured (e.g., how socio-economic attributes were quantified).• Indicate whether ethical considerations were addressed during the data collection. <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <p>The current text, while informative, lacks context, focus, and cross-comparison with similar studies. However, incorporating the following suggestions can enhance the presentation and quality of the discussion.</p> <p>Important revisions for this section include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure that each result is followed by an appropriate discussion that interprets its significance. For example:• Discuss why specific socio-economic attributes are highly correlated with technology adoption and what this means for policy or practice.• Add a comparative analysis with other studies to place findings in a broader context.• Summarize data more effectively in the text, emphasizing trends and key findings instead of listing all percentages.• Ensure that each result is followed by an appropriate discussion that interprets its significance <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discuss why specific socio-economic attributes are highly correlated with technology adoption	<p>Admitted and improve as suggested under revised manuscript</p>

Review Form 3

	<p>and what this means for policy or practice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Add a comparative analysis with other studies to place findings in a broader context. <p>Table and Figures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consolidate data where possible (e.g., group variables or categories to reduce clutter).• Ensure all tables have self-explanatory captions and are referenced in the text.• Add a figure or graph to visually depict correlations for better readability.	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The reference list is too limited for a scientific manuscript. Much of the text in the manuscript is uncited, raising concerns about the originality and validity of the claims made. This section requires significant revision, with an emphasis on incorporating the most recent and relevant references, particularly those published in widely accessible, highly peer-reviewed journals.</p>	<p>Incorporated under reference as suggested</p>
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The current manuscript contains inconsistent tenses, grammatical errors, and redundant phrasing in several sections. To improve the overall quality, the following suggestions are provided:</p> <p>Revision Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Revise sentences for clarity and conciseness. <p>Example:</p> <p>Original: "The maximum number of respondents had membership in two or more organizations, while the overall social participation level of the respondents was moderate."</p> <p>Revised: "Most respondents were members of two or more organizations, indicating moderate social participation."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Consider using professional editing tools or consulting a language expert to refine the manuscript and ensure grammatical accuracy and consistency. <p>Etc.</p>	<p>Incorporated under revised manuscript</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Include a brief discussion of how the findings could be operationalized to improve maize farming practices or livelihoods in the study area and beyond. Justify if the study's methodology or findings offer a novel contribution or not.</p>	<p>Adopted as suggested</p>

PART 2:

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