

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_127252
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Effectiveness of Extension and Advisory Service (EAS) Providers in a Pluralistic Extension System of West Bengal
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study explores the comparative effectiveness of various Extension and Advisory Service (EAS) providers in West Bengal's pluralistic agricultural extension system, where multiple public and private actors support farmers. Using dimensions of effectiveness—Accessibility, Accountability, Relevancy, Responsibility, Timeliness, Cost-Effectiveness, and Empathy—the research measures farmers' perceptions across four EAS providers: Farmer Producer Companies (FPCs), Agricultural Technology Management Agency (ATMA) and Department of Agriculture (DoA), Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK), and Input Dealers in Birbhum, Jalpaiguri, and Nadia districts.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Comparative Effectiveness of Extension and Advisory Service (EAS) Providers in a Pluralistic Extension System of West Bengal," is mostly suitable as it captures the core focus of the study: comparing different EAS providers within West Bengal's pluralistic system. However, it could be improved slightly for clarity and conciseness.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>Additions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit mention of the target audience (e.g., policymakers, agricultural practitioners). • Specific outcomes or metrics used in evaluating effectiveness. • A concluding remark emphasizing the study's contribution to existing knowledge. <p>Deletions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove overly technical jargon or excessively detailed methodology if present, as abstracts are meant to be concise and accessible. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research evaluates multiple dimensions of EAS, such as Accessibility, Accountability, Relevancy, Responsibility, Timeliness, Cost Effectiveness, and Empathy, using farmers' perceptions to rank the effectiveness of four providers: Farmer Producer Companies (FPCs), ATMA & Department of Agriculture (DoA), Input Dealers, and Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK)	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Jayantkumar Vijay Rane
Department, University & Country	The Rashtrasant Tukadoji Maharaj Nagpur University, India