

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_107409
Title of the Manuscript:	LEVEL OF DERIVED BENEFITS IN FPOs
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The subject of the manuscript is important for the scientific.</p> <p>2. The title of the manuscript is not suitable; it could be "the effect of ..."</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. It explains the content of the text well enough.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate except that there is no literature review which has to be present in an academic article.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is somewhat scientifically correct but it has many drawbacks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The author(s) thinks that the reader knows what all abbreviations stand for such as NABARD. These abbreviations must be explained.</li> <li>• Methodology is very weak. The econometric method is not explained thoroughly. Although the text says that correlation analysis is used, the results of a regression analysis are presented.</li> <li>• The author(s) does not explain how the performance of FPOs are calculated.</li> <li>• In Table 2 the coefficient is not statistically significant according to t value.</li> <li>• In Table 2, r value is significant what r value stands for also is not explained.</li> </ul> <p>6. The references are also very weak. Social capital is a very wide concept and it has been studied by many researchers such as Kustepeli, Yesim, et al. (2023), Cofré-Bravo, Gabriela, Laurens Klerkx, and Alejandra Engler. (2019), Fitzpatrick E, Akgüngör S (2019), Robison LJ, Schmid AA, Siles ME (2002)</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. The English is weak and there are many grammar mistakes. The language of the article is not suitable for scholarly communication and it has to be reviewed completely.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

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

## Review Form 1.7

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Yeşim Kuştepe</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dokuz Eylül University, Turkey</b>