

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
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

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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides an in-depth analysis of the impact of Farmer Producer Companies (FPCs) on small and marginal farmers in Tamil Nadu. By focusing on both quantitative data and qualitative insights, the study highlights how FPCs can empower farmers through improved market access and enhanced income levels. I appreciate the manuscript's emphasis on gender representation, particularly the predominance of female members, which adds a crucial dimension to the understanding of rural empowerment. The SWOT analysis offers a balanced view of the strengths and challenges faced by FPCs, paving the way for targeted strategies to enhance their effectiveness. Overall, the findings contribute significantly to discussions on sustainable agricultural practices and the socio-economic upliftment of farmers in India.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and in accordance with the article.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are	
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.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its rigorous methodological approach, including a well-defined sample size of 140 members from seven FPCs, which enhances the reliability of the findings. The use of demographic factors, income levels, and governance structures as key variables allows for a comprehensive analysis of the impact of FPCs on farmers. Additionally, the incorporation of a SWOT analysis provides a structured framework for evaluating both the strengths and weaknesses of the FPC model, reflecting a balanced perspective. The focus on quantitative data, such as the reported 20% increase in millet yields, combined with qualitative insights, strengthens the technical soundness of the research and supports its conclusions effectively.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	They are recent and sufficient	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Roxana Mihalache
Department, University & Country	Iasi University of Life Sciences, Romania