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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The manuscript addresses a relevant topic in the context of sustainable agriculture and renewable energy adoption among smallholder farmers. Its focus on the PM-KUSUM scheme provides valuable insights into the socio-economic barriers to clean energy uptake. If methodologically strengthened, the study could offer useful evidence to guide policy in similar rural settings. | Thank You. Methodology is as per the objectives and also what I want to convey the result, but as per your suggestion, I made some corrections in it. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title  **"Assessment of the Socio-Economic Impact and Farmers’ Awareness of the PM KUSUM Scheme (Component B) in Uttar Pradesh, India"**  is informative but **too long and structurally overloaded**. It combines multiple ideas (impact assessment, awareness, scheme details, and geographical scope) in a way that may reduce clarity and readability.  Issues:  Exceeds the recommended 12–15 word limit.  Contains nested parentheses (Component B), which affect fluidity.  Lacks precise focus—tries to cover both "impact" and "awareness" without clear distinction.  **Suggested Alternative Title:**  **"Farmer Awareness and Socio-Economic Determinants of PM-KUSUM Adoption in Uttar Pradesh, India"** | Thank you for suggesting this in-depth for my topic. I consider that alternative title you suggested. |
| 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, although covering the topic in broad terms, lacks precision in presenting key methodological elements. It does not clearly specify the type of analysis (Binary Logistic Regression), nor does it state the sample size or the sampling method—both are essential components in empirical studies. Moreover, the results are presented descriptively, without any statistical indicators or quantitative support. | I noted all things you suggested in the abstract and made reasonable changes. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here. | The manuscript addresses a relevant topic, but it lacks scientific rigor due to methodological issues, insufficient statistical diagnostics, and a biased sampling approach. The analysis is mostly descriptive and lacks theoretical depth. Major revisions are needed to ensure scientific accuracy. | I noted what you suggested and made reasonable changes in the manuscript. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The manuscript uses a limited number and scope of references, with only a few (approximately four) cited in the literature review section. While some are recent (2022–2024), the overall count is insufficient for a study of this scale and complexity. There is also a lack of foundational theoretical references and comparative international studies on renewable energy adoption in agriculture. | There is not much research done before 2022, but in the manuscript, there are some situations from 2019, 2020, 2021, 2017, 2013, and 2018. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The overall language quality is generally acceptable for scholarly communication. While minor grammatical and stylistic improvements are recommended, the manuscript is understandable and mostly clear. A light copyediting pass would help enhance flow and precision. | I make some changes. |
| Optional/General comments | Following a thorough review of the manuscript titled **"Assessment of the Socio-Economic Impact and Farmer’s Awareness of the PM KUSUM Scheme (Component B) in Uttar Pradesh, India),"** it is evident that the topic falls within the important domain of sustainable development and agricultural energy. While the research addresses a practically and theoretically relevant issue, the manuscript, despite notable fieldwork efforts, does not currently meet the standards of academic publication. It exhibits significant methodological, theoretical, and linguistic shortcomings that necessitate substantial revision across multiple dimensions.  **1. General Structure**  The title exceeds the recommended academic length (more than 15 words) and includes a syntactic structure that compromises clarity. The abstract, although covering the topic in broad terms, lacks precision in presenting key methodological elements. It does not clearly specify the type of analysis (Binary Logistic Regression), nor does it state the sample size or the sampling method—both are essential components in empirical studies. Moreover, the results are presented descriptively, without any statistical indicators or quantitative support.  **2. Originality and Research Problem**  Despite the relevance of the subject, the research problem suffers from a lack of conceptual structure. No explicit research question or testable hypotheses are provided, nor is there a theoretical framework underpinning the study (e.g., Rogers’ Diffusion of Innovations Theory). The problem remains descriptive, lacking critical analysis of the barriers to adoption or the causal mechanisms involved. Additionally, the research gap is not clearly articulated; the author merely outlines some challenges without demonstrating how this study uniquely addresses a deficiency in the existing literature, particularly within the local context of Bahraich.  **3. Literature Review**  This section is notably weak, both in the number of references and their analytical depth. Only four studies are reviewed, without any critical or comparative analysis linking them to the current research. The discussion remains superficial and descriptive, lacking categorization by theme or methodology, and fails to build a theoretical foundation for the study. The section does not show how the current research addresses a clear gap in the literature or contributes a theoretical or empirical novelty.  **4. Methodology and Statistical Analysis**  While the use of Binary Logistic Regression is appropriate, the manuscript does not include essential diagnostic tests such as multicollinearity (VIF) or model fit statistics (e.g., Nagelkerke R²). The sampling design is problematic due to the heavy reliance on snowball sampling, which limits the representativeness of the data and threatens statistical validity. Furthermore, the interpretation of the regression results is shallow and lacks integration with the broader social or practical context of the findings.  **5. Language and Academic Style**  The manuscript contains numerous linguistic and terminological errors, in addition to weak logical flow between paragraphs. The writing style tends to be informal and descriptive in several sections, which undermines the academic tone and clarity of the argument.  **6. Referencing and APA Style**  The manuscript does not adhere consistently to APA 7th edition guidelines. Several references listed in the final bibliography are not cited in the text, and vice versa. Additionally, many references lack DOIs or electronic links where applicable. Tables are not formatted according to APA style; they contain vertical lines and lack explanatory notes.  **7. Conclusion and Recommendations**  The study’s findings are not sufficiently utilized to generate actionable recommendations. The proposed recommendations are overly general, lacking specificity regarding implementation mechanisms or target stakeholders. Furthermore, the conclusion fails to suggest directions for future research or identify opportunities for scaling or policy integration.  **Additional Note on Data Inconsistencies**  There are observable inconsistencies between the numerical data in the tables and their corresponding textual descriptions. For instance, in the tables on education and income, the claim of parity between illiterate and graduate respondents in the ₹50,001–75,000 income bracket overlooks the fact that graduates are also represented in the higher-income category (>₹100,000), which was not discussed. Similarly, the awareness percentages reported in Table 7 lack clarity regarding the sample size used, weakening the reliability of interpretation.  **Final Recommendation:**  **Major revision required**  **Recommendations for Improvement:**   * Reformulate the research problem with a clear research question and testable hypotheses. * Expand and critically evaluate the literature to demonstrate a clear knowledge gap. * Strengthen the statistical methodology with diagnostic testing and variable justification. * Fully comply with APA 7 formatting for references and tables. * Conduct a comprehensive language review to improve academic clarity and tone. * Link recommendations directly to the data and suggest practical, evidence-based actions. | Following suggestion has considered and made a suitable changes. |
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