

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_120649
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Group Efficiency of Farmer Producer Organizations in the Eastern Region of India: Insights and Implications
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The authors have undertaken an intriguing study that delves into the efficiency of Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) in the Malda District of West Bengal. The study explores the factors influencing FPO performance, including women's participation, leadership qualities, and access to information. The research employs a range of statistical methods, providing valuable insights into the determinants of FPO efficiency.</p> <p>The study employs both simple and purposive sampling methods to gather data from 90 respondents across 9 villages. This mixed-method approach ensures a representative sample and targeted insights. However, it would be beneficial to provide more details on the rationale behind the selection of the specific FPOs</p> <p>The study's geographical focus on Malda District may limit the generalizability of its findings. A discussion on how these results could be applicable to other regions or under different conditions would strengthen the paper. Additionally, addressing potential biases in the sampling method would add to the study's credibility.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title is suitable.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article provides a good overview of the research objectives, methodology, and key findings. However, it can be enhanced for better clarity and comprehensiveness. Here are a few suggestions for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlight the most significant results, such as the impact of women's participation and leadership on FPO efficiency. • Summarize the practical implications of the findings for policymakers and stakeholders. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>While the tables and figures are informative, their presentation could be improved. Clearer labeling and more detailed captions would aid in understanding the results. For instance, Table 1 could benefit from a more explicit explanation of the scoring system and criteria</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its rigorous research methodology and comprehensive statistical analysis. The use of multiple advanced statistical techniques, including descriptive statistics, correlation, regression, ANOVA, and factor analysis, ensures the reliability and validity of the findings. The systematic approach to data collection, which combines simple and purposive sampling methods, adds depth and credibility to the study. Furthermore, the inclusion of a balanced sample of both FPO members and non-members provides a holistic view of the factors influencing FPO efficiency, enhancing the study's overall scientific correctness.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =</p>	<p>While the paper references relevant literature, the review appears limited, relying on a few selected sources. A more comprehensive and in-depth literature review would provide a stronger theoretical foundation.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the manuscript are suitable for scholarly communications. The authors communicate their findings clearly and precisely, using appropriate academic terminology and a formal tone. While minor improvements in clarity and data presentation could enhance readability, the manuscript meets the standards expected for academic publications.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>While the study effectively highlights important factors such as women's participation and strong external networks, the following issues should be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study acknowledges the importance of external support but could further explore specific external factors, such as government policies and market dynamics, impacting FPO efficiency. • The potential challenges and limitations faced during the data collection process, such as cultural or language barriers, should be acknowledged and addressed to ensure the validity and reliability of the data collected. • The paper could benefit from a more detailed discussion on future research directions. Suggesting specific areas for further investigation, such as the impact of digital tools on FPO efficiency or the role of policy interventions, would provide a roadmap for continued exploration. <p>Addressing these issues would strengthen the research paper and contribute to a more robust and comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing FPO efficiency</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Komal Chhikara
Department, University & Country	University of Delhi, India