

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	Research article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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 topic holds significant scientific importance as it provides comprehensive insights into the functioning, impact, and potential of collective agricultural organization models. It contributes to various fields of study, including economics, environmental science, social sciences, and agricultural technology by giving insights to organisational dynamics, community empowerment economic impact, resource management and innovation diffusion. The study findings support the development of evidence-based policies and practices that can enhance the livelihoods of farmers and promote sustainable agricultural development.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title can be shortened like 'Assessing Group Efficiency of Farmer Producer Organizations in the Eastern Region of India'</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 is comprehensive, but it can be improved. I would like to suggest some points. Abstract should start with one introductory sentence about the FPO and its influence. This sentence should be followed by the study details. The sampling, data collection should be clearly described in short summarised way. Only major analytical tools to be mentioned in abstract. Major results to be highlighted and corresponding policy implications to be included.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Subsections need improvement.</p> <p>Introduction: Clearly establish the connection between FO and FPO. If possible include standard definitions with proper references. Rationale of study to be elaborated with more discussion on study objectives.</p> <p>Methodology: This section requires more information about study area. Scientific explanation about sampling methods, sample size is required. Please confirm whether simple random sampling is used or not. Analytical tools (like Kruskal Wallis test, factor analysis, regression model etc) to be explained in detail in this section rather than with the results. Please avoid numbering and present it as running matter with sub headings.</p> <p>Conclusion: Policy implications to be clearly explained. Future study suggestions to be included.</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>The data is analysed using suitable analytical tools. Group efficiency and related aspects are analysed properly. Results provide empirical evidence and supports the objective. The diagrammatic representation of the collaboration network visually describes the factors and such attempts are rarely done. Methodological aspects of the research article maintain higher standards.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>References are not very recent but sufficient. The standard definitions and reference of FPO may be added.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Neetha Rose C D
Department, University & Country	Kerala Agricultural University, India