

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_124790
Title of the Manuscript:	A Holistic Review On Impact Of Demonetization On Animal Husbandry Sector
Type of the Article	Review 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 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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides an in-depth analysis of the impact of demonetization on the animal husbandry sector, a vital component of India's rural economy. It highlights both the short-term challenges, such as cash shortages affecting productivity, and the long-term effects, like the shift towards digital payments. This review could serve as a valuable resource for policymakers aiming to strengthen economic resilience in agricultural sectors that heavily rely on cash transactions.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title is descriptive but could be more concise. Suggested alternative: "Impact of Demonetization on India's Animal Husbandry Sector: A Comprehensive Review." This version is more straightforward while maintaining the core message.</p>	
<p>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>	<p>The abstract covers the major impacts of demonetization comprehensively but could benefit from increased clarity. I suggest breaking down the key findings into bullet points or including clearer segmentation to distinguish between short-term and long-term impacts. Additionally, emphasizing the government's initiatives to mitigate the effects should be highlighted more prominently for better balance.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure is generally well-organized, with clear subsections that guide the reader through the different aspects of demonetization's effects on the animal husbandry sector. However, a brief "Limitations of the Study" subsection could improve the manuscript by addressing the limitations in scope or data availability.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust, utilizing various studies and data points to support the analysis. It effectively draws on empirical evidence from different contexts to paint a comprehensive picture of the effects of demonetization on the sector. However, the discussion of certain effects could be more critical, for instance, assessing how lasting the changes in digital adoption have been in subsequent years.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are mostly recent and relevant, with a good balance of different types of sources. To strengthen the analysis, including some references on the broader economic impact of demonetization on rural economies beyond just animal husbandry would provide additional context.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language Quality: The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are some grammatical errors and areas where the phrasing could be more concise. I suggest a thorough proofreading to enhance clarity and readability.</p> <p>Additional Notes: Including a graphical representation (like a flowchart or timeline) of the major events and impacts could make the manuscript more engaging and accessible.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript has strong content and structure, but it would benefit from some language refinements and more detailed presentation of government mitigation measures.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jayanth H.
Department, University & Country	St. Claret College, India