

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_98383
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF TECHNICAL EFFICIENCY OF RICE FARMERS UNDER FARMER PRODUCER ORGANIZATION (FPO) IN GUNTUR DISTRICT OF ANDHRA PRADESH.
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:

<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes. Article demonstrate the use of DEA and SEA techniques in analysis technical and economic efficiency of farmers. Title is appropriate. OK. Good. Whenever the data is referenced it is necessary to indicate the geographical context. For example, rice is cultivated in 457.6 lakh hectares. It is necessary to mention clearly that data refers to All India for the clarity of readers. The article uses software in estimating technical and economic efficiency, results are adequate. Authors could have gone for little higher sample size than mere 40 respondents. References are adequate. NIL	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
Optional/General comments	Article is well organised. Accept as it is with minor correction regarding data referred and its geographical context.	

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:	H. Chandrashekar
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences, India