

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_117489
Title of the Manuscript:	EXTENSION STRATEGIES AND MODELS IN AGRI TRADING THROUGH FARMER PRODUCER COMPANIES (FPCs): A WAY TOWARDS SUSTAINABILITY
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important to the scientific community especially as it speaks to a key topic of driving agricultural sustainability across developing nations with a key focus on India which has made great progress in agriculture over the years. Other developing nations can draw insights in further strengthening agricultural practices in rural and underserved communities in order to improve livelihoods.</p> <p>2. The title captures the content fairly well.</p> <p>3. The abstract has captured the key points of the article and by estimation is appropriate.</p> <p>4. While the article is a review, a section on experiences of smallholder farmers will be useful in further amplifying the gaps that exist.</p> <p>5. Yes it is.</p> <p>6. Referencing is both sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and tone of writing is suitable for scholarly communications. Terms are well captured and easy to read in plain terms.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Further work is encouraged to gain more insights on practices across other developing nations like Nigeria to better understand gaps and shared learnings which will be helpful in developing policies that speaks to the current realities. Great work by the author.</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:	Terese Shadrach Akpem
Department, University & Country	Nigeria