

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_97423
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON THE PERFORMANCE OF PRADHAN MANTRI FASAL BIMA YOJANA (PMFBY) CROP INSURANCE IN INDIA
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This study evaluated the performance of Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana (PMFBY) crop insurance scheme in India. The research results are expected to provide information and recommendations related to crop insurance. However, the manuscript is still limited in providing information, not yet at the recommendation level. In addition, research novelty has not been clearly stated.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the manuscript has been described quite comprehensively, but it is necessary to add a highlight of the results of this research.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. In the manuscript there is no result and discussion section.</p> <p>5. The methods section should display the stages of the research. Discussion that is equipped with an adequate basis of reference is not yet available. The multiple regression results are not described in the manuscript.</p> <p>6. The references are insufficient and not recent; besides that, they have not been used to discuss research results. In addition, references listed in the references section must be cited in the manuscript. There are several references that are not cited in the manuscript. It is recommended to use the reference system.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	It is recommended to use proofread.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	In my opinion, this article may be Accepted after a major revision by the authors.	

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:	Endang Retno Wedowati
Department, University & Country	Universitas Wijaya Kusuma Surabaya, Indonesia