

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125236
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Impact of Socio-Economic Status on the Economic Performance of Farmer Producer Companies in the Southern Districts of Tamil Nadu
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	Study on the socio economic status is important to understand the impact on livelihood, effectiveness of FPOs and needs and challenges of farmers. The study will be useful for policy makers to design targeted interventions for the further schemes regarding FPOs. It will be useful for the monitoring and evaluation also.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title can be given as "Socio-Economic Status and Economic Performance of Farmer Producer Companies in the Southern Districts of Tamil Nadu", because the word 'impact' cannot be given as the paper deals with only descriptive statistics.	
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.	Yes, however the implication from the study can be added in the last few sentences.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) In the introduction paragraph- need, scope/implication and limitation of the study is missing</li> <li>2) Research Design can be mentioned and taken as a sub section in Methodology</li> <li>3) Operational Definitions of the variables can be added for the better understanding</li> <li>4) Map of the study area can be added to increase the credibility, readability and understanding of the study.</li> <li>5) The result and discussion can be sub-sub divided according to the variable and add the discussion part for the results.</li> <li>6) Either table or figure is required, however both of them together can lengthen the manuscript.</li> <li>7) Reference can be written according to journal guidelines.</li> <li>8) Implication of the study can be included in the conclusion part</li> <li>9) Abbreviations and full forms can be included</li> </ol>	
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.	Yes, the manuscript is scientific correct. The study of the profile of the sample is useful for understanding their standard of living, which plays a significant role in the analysis of effectiveness of FPOs.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Further References can be added as the discussion part for the results are missing along with the supporting studies. However the NABARD FAQ reference (introduction), Birthal and Joshi reference (farmer collectives area), Asha Elizabeth Jose references (sustainability of FPOs) can be missing	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Yes, the language is satisfactory, however improvement can be made especially past tense can be used, 'per cent' can be used, numerical can be used with decimals.</li><li>2) In introduction, the unnecessary deviation to millets and sustainability of the FPCs are a bit confusing because the paper is not focusing and find a solution for the issues.</li><li>3) Methodology- Proper sampling techniques is mandatory to be mentioned along with reason for selection.</li><li>4) Discussion part is strictly mandatory to be mentioned because without discussion part, the implication of the study is not valid.</li><li>5) Titles of the sections of the research paper should be according to the journal guidelines. For example, instead of 'MATERIALS AND METHODS' and 'ANALYTICAL PROCEDURE' use the term mentioned by the journal guidelines.</li><li>6) Incorporate Standard Deviation along with mean in the table.</li></ol>	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Either add one table for all the variable's descriptive statistic or else use separate table for each variable, but don't make it into 2 tables. However, the first one is preferred as it reduces the length of the manuscript.</li></ol>	

#### **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:	Asha Elizabeth Jose
Department, University & Country	National Academy of Agricultural Research Management, India