

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_107042
Title of the Manuscript:	Government Agriculture Schemes in India: A review
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes. India is the first largest agricultural country in the world in fields of milk, pulses and jute, and the second largest one of rice, wheat, sugarcane, groundnut, vegetables, fruit and cotton. Meanwhile, the government plays an extremely important part in these programs. Thus, the review study on government agriculture programs is a meaningful topic.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	This sentence in the Abstracts needs to be fixed. "The abstract examines prominent initiatives such as the Pradhan Mantri Kisan Samman Nidhi (PM-KISAN) which aims to provide direct income support to farmers, the Soil Health Card Scheme for improving soil fertility and enhancing crop yields, and the National Agricultural Market (e-NAM) to create a unified platform for seamless agricultural trade. Furthermore, the abstract sheds light on the Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY) and the Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana (PMFBY), designed to boost agricultural infrastructure and insure farmers against crop losses, respectively".	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The review does not have the method. Why were those agriculture programs chosen for review? This needs to be clarified in the research methods section.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	In general, the review mainly collects and interprets scattered information for each program. The authors have not included evaluation criteria for the schemes. Why does the author not classify, group, compare, and then assess them? Especially, after COVID-19 pandemic, how government agricultural schemes tend to change? Therefore, I do not see this study to offer significant findings. Besides, many places in the manuscript are lacking citations. Any information in the manuscript needs to be shown clearly for the readers to know the sources that are cited from other studies or come from your findings e.g.: + Table 1. I do know the summary in table 1 coming from the authors or other studies. Even, many points in the table 1 are not referred clearly in the text. + "It is one of the flagship government agriculture schemes in India, launched in 2019. It aims to provide direct income support to small and marginal farmers, recognizing the importance of ensuring financial stability for farmers in the face of various challenges. Under the PM-KISAN scheme, eligible farmers receive Rs. 6,000 per year, paid in three equal installments of Rs. 2,000 each directly into their bank accounts. The scheme's objective is to supplement farmers' income, meet their investment needs, and enable them to adopt modern agricultural practices without the burden of debt. By providing a stable source of income, PM-KISAN seeks to reduce agrarian	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>distress and contribute to rural prosperity.”</p> <p>+ “The Soil Health Card Scheme is a crucial government agriculture initiative in India aimed at promoting sustainable and productive farming practices. Launched in 2015, the scheme seeks to assess the nutrient status of agricultural soils and provide personalized recommendations to farmers, enabling them to make informed decisions about fertilizer application and crop selection. Under the Soil Health Card Scheme, soil samples are collected from farmers' fields and analyzed for essential nutrients like nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, and micronutrients. Based on the soil analysis, farmers receive a Soil Health Card that provides detailed information about the nutrient content of their soil, along with customized recommendations for appropriate fertilizers and soil amendments. This helps farmers optimize fertilizer use, reduce input costs, and improve crop yields while maintaining soil health.”</p> <p>+ “It is a significant agricultural insurance scheme launched in India in 2016. The scheme aims to provide crop insurance coverage to farmers against yield losses caused by various factors, including natural calamities, pests, and diseases. PMFBY aims to reduce the financial burden on farmers during crop failures and provide them with a safety net to manage risk and uncertainty in agriculture. Under PMFBY, farmers pay a nominal premium, and the remaining premium is shared equally by the central and state governments. The scheme offers comprehensive coverage, including pre-sowing to post-harvest risks, and allows farmers to insure multiple crops. Claims are settled based on crop loss assessments conducted by government-appointed agencies, ensuring transparency and timely compensation.”</p> <p>+etc.</p>	
<p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Some publications should be used to have more discussion and implications in the manuscript, such as:</b></p> <p>+ Singh, P., &amp; Agrawal, G. (2020). Development, present status and performance analysis of agriculture insurance schemes in India: Review of evidence. <i>International Journal of Social Economics</i>, 47(4), 461-481.</p> <p>+ Dhawan, V. (2017, January). Water and agriculture in India. In <i>Background paper for the South Asia expert panel during the Global Forum for Food and Agriculture</i> (Vol. 28, pp. 80-85).</p> <p>+ Priyadarshini, P., &amp; Abhilash, P. C. (2020). Policy recommendations for enabling transition towards sustainable agriculture in India. <i>Land Use Policy</i>, 96, 104718.</p> <p>+ Jaiswal, S., Kharade, T., Kotambe, N., &amp; Shinde, S. (2020). Collaborative recommendation system for agriculture sector. In <i>ITM web of conferences</i> (Vol. 32, p. 03034). EDP Sciences.</p> <p>+ Kumar, A., Padhee, A. K., &amp; Kumar, S. (2020). How Indian agriculture should change after COVID-19. <i>Food Security</i>, 12, 837-840.</p> <p>+ Varshney, D., Kumar, A., Mishra, A. K., Rashid, S., &amp; Joshi, P. K. (2021). India's COVID-19 social assistance package and its impact on the agriculture sector. <i>Agricultural Systems</i>, 189, 103049.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Some other suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Colons are not placed at the end of sections in scientific articles</li> <li>- Many places need to be fixed in English styles.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I recommend this article for publication only if it is seriously edited in accordance with my comments above.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tuyet-Anh T. Le</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Science and the Environment, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada</b>