



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_31740
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield gap analysis in adoption of production technology of mango by the farmers
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	Check grammar and spelling through all the document, specially the Abstract Line 57: what big and homogeneous is you study area? Provide some details on climate and topography. This is important to assess the involved degree of variability Line 59: how do you define big and small farmers? Line 60: your sample size was 200, but what is the size of your universe? How many farmers in total are in Gubbi taluk? Line 61: provide a brief description of the interview structure and the main questions considered Lines 62-63: what did you do at the frontline demonstration, off-campus and on-campus training? What activities were considered? How long they lasted? How many attendees you had? Line 65: what experiment? So far, no experiment has been outlined? Please provide details Line 66: how do you define and standardize potential yield? Production is affected by climate, soil, management practices, varieties and clones, and orchard age, orchard size, tree density, labour availability, inputs availability, market price among many other factors. How do you define your "best" conditions for production? There is a lot of variation implied, how did you standardize production for comparison purposes? This a central issue for your study, please clarify Line 72: describe the technology components in the demonstration plot Line 77: how data were processed and analysed? Line 90: giving the variation implied in the study, it would	1. Potential yield means maximum yield can be obtain. 2. Big farmers mean more cultivable area, small farmer mean less cultivable area. 3. Interview structure are scientist, extension worker, agriculture, horticulture and line department officers. 4. Frontline demonstration is demonstration of new technology in large scale at farmers field for increases yield and return of farmers. Off-campus means training programme conducted in farmers field related to FLD and adopted technology, interaction, group discussion with farmers and field visit to farmers plot. On-campus means training programme conducted in KVK campus with same farmers, visit demo plot at kvk. 5. Production is affected by many factor but, same climate, soil, management, same variety , same age plot were selected. All factors were same for all sample farmers. Best condition means suitable climate, soil, good management for production of mango. 6. technology components were all integrated crop management in production of mango. 7. photos were taken with action photo with farmers at farmers field. 8. all points were included as per reviewer



SDI Review Form 1.6

	be expected to provide an indication of the variability of your variables, ie. Standard deviation, standard error Line 97: how do you define adoption? It is really adoption (mediated by an extension worker) or it is only use? What about exposure? Were all farmers aware of the available technology and did they have the information and means to put that into practice? Line 98: what a “medium level of adoption” is? Please define such levels in the Methodology section Line 131: full and partial adoption have not been defined yet. Also, if the number and percentage are the same, there is not use in including both. Finally, why not a statistical comparison between big and small farmers was intended? Lines 140-141: all these variables should be defined in the Methodology section Line 171: suggestion: compare statistically big versus small farmers Line 286 on: photographs seem to be out of place for this type of paper	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 18: I think the variety name is Alphonso, not alphanso. Please check Line 39: check punctuation at the end of the line Line 44: hand book is not the author. Note the institution responsible instead. Line 92: integrate this line into the Methodology section Lines 93 – 95: there are many other potential causes for such variability, ie climate, topography, soil, water availability, pests and diseases, management practices, intensity of extension effort, tree varieties, and orchard age, just to name a few Line 104: there were 100 big and 100 farmers. Is that representative of the composition of farming in the study area?	Corrected all point.authors of hHand book referred is university head.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Many methodological details are missing. Thus, results are not convincing. There is a lot of room for improvement	