



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_49600</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Farmers' Network Analysis on Diffusion and Adoption of CAU-R1varietyin Imphal East district of Manipur</b>
Type of the 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>This research represents a nice and interesting approach to understand the drivers to adoption/non adoption and continuing/replacement of a innovation tool by small farmers. It includes a great number of variables, and in general is well written, but it lacks some information from methodology to fully understand all analyses. And most important, there is no discussion of results. Authors are citing a few references, but only to state "results agree what X found", and this is meaningless. We need to understand the reach of the results, and particularly in this case, the meaning of them. For example: what means that "social participation was found to be positively correlated with the In-degree centrality of the farmers", in social terms? In order to understand which factors are influencing in adoption or in replacement of this variety and how they are influencing, results need to be discussed, supported by other references that provide more information than just agreeing these results or not.</p> <p><b>Methodology</b> I think that a location map would be useful to help readers to locate the study area. In this section, all the procedures and analyses should be clearly stated. For example, you are saying "Statistical analysis was carried out using SPSS 21 version", but you are not indicating which statistical analysis are you computing, or which are your variables. Also, some of the variables need to be explained how they were measured, such as social participation, cosmopolitanness, innovativeness and risk bearing ability. Actually, you only shortly explained how you did measured the social network, but not the other groups of variables (i.e., adoption and the variables mentioned above). And even the social network measures are not clear. How did you measured the centrality of important actors? As far as I understand, you applied "pre-tested structured interview schedules" for that purpose. Is that right? I think it would be useful to include the interview as supplementary material. Furthermore, after reading the results (specifically the 3.2 section), I have a couple of questions: Which variety were they cultivating before the program was launched? All of them had the same variety? And there are no references where CAU R1 is compared to other local and commonly used varieties?</p> <p><b>Results and discussion</b> Section 3.1, first paragraph: please add the reference of NCAER 2001. Please substitute "percent" by "%" along this section. Tables and Figures legends should be self-explanatory. Section 3.2, first paragraph: please provide a reference for the Roger's Diffusion of Innovation theory, and also include it in the methodology section. Page 6, line 1: Which are those 18 practices from the package? You even mention some of them latter ("The practice with least adoption score was the pest and disease management"), but there are absent from the results. I recommend to include a table with those practices and the evaluation of them, or at least as complementary material. Page 6, last paragraph: This is very interesting. Almost half the total respondants have replaced this variety for a local one, due to "disenchantment". This should be more discussed: why farmers are disenchanting? You briefly mention "taste and market price", but I think here is one of the main results from the research, and you need to try to understand why is this happening, so you could try to find solutions to the specific problems related to this variety. Page 7: All this paragraph is actually part of the methodology. It should be transferred to that section. I recommend to merge all four figures into a single one with four letters and a common legend.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Page 12, left column: The sentence "...implying that the more years of experience reduced will be the rate of reaching other farmers in the network" is awkward, I do not understand it. Please rephrase it.</p> <p>Conclusions section is fine, but some information appears for the first time, like the lack of monitoring. Conclusions should derive from results and discussion.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Marina Mazón Programa de</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National University of Loja, Ecuador</b>