

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124521
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>An Analysis of Constraints Faced by PM-KISAN Beneficiaries across Southern States of India: Key Issues and Policy Implications</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it offers a comprehensive analysis of the challenges faced by PM-KISAN beneficiaries and provides valuable data on the scheme that impacts many farmers. The use of the Rank-Based Quotient (RBQ) method is insightful, as it offers a structured approach for understanding beneficiary issues. I like the manuscript's policy recommendations, including revising eligibility criteria and improving the transparency in fund distribution, which are crucial to enhancing the scheme's effectiveness.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title of the article is very clear and informative.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive and covers all the key points including the study's objective, methodology, findings, and policy implications. However, adding a brief sentence on the context/ purpose/ significance of the PM-Kishan scheme in agriculture could help the readers familiar with the scheme. It would also enhance the overall completeness of the abstract.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are mostly appropriate but here are a few suggestions for more clarity and a better flow.</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Introduction effectively establishes the context of the study. But the sentence "This study aims to assess..." would be more appropriately placed in the objectives section, as it addresses the study's objectives.</li> <li>2. One or two more explicit statements on the significance of the study particularly in five southern states could strengthen this section.</li> </ol> <p><b>Objectives:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The objectives mentioned in the manuscript could be more specific and broken down into more precise sub-objectives such as identifying key constraints, ranking them, and examining state-wise differences etc.</li> </ol> <p><b>Literature Review:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Subdividing it into major themes addressed by past studies could provide a more systematic understanding.</li> </ol> <p><b>Materials and Methods:</b></p> <p>This section is well-structured. However, a few improvements could make the section more engaging to the reader.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Including a few sentences explaining the rationale for choosing the RBQ method would enhance clarity and provide a deeper understanding.</li> <li>2. Once introduced, abbreviations such as PM-KISAN and RBQ should be used consistently without repeating the full term.</li> <li>3. "The per cent position of each rank then converted into scores referring to the Table [10]."</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>Table 10 is missing from the article, and including it would provide the reader with a clearer understanding of the method.</p> <p><b>Results and Discussion:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This section should remain distinct and might be split into subsections: one focusing on presenting the results and the other on discussing the implications. This would allow for a more clear interpretation of findings.</li> <li>2. "The constraints faced by PM KISAN beneficiaries .....380 respondents in each of the state." These sentences could be omitted as they describe the methodology of the study and have already been thoroughly explained in the respective section.</li> <li>3. The analysis could benefit from deeper insights into why certain constraints are more severe in certain states. A brief discussion on socio-economic factors would add richness to this analysis.</li> <li>4. The references in the manuscript cover a range of relevant studies. Therefore, the comparative analysis of the results with those of previous studies could enhance the quality of the manuscript.</li> <li>5. Including geographic maps or diagrams showing the district distribution and the severity of constraints across the states would make the analysis more dynamic.</li> <li>6. The data presented in Table 2 is informative, but incorporating a graphical representation, showing rank-wise constraints would enhance the clarity and significance of the findings. While Figure 1 nearly fulfils this purpose, replacing the percentage of beneficiaries with rank details would further improve readability.</li> <li>7. "67.50 per cent respondents found in .... "Lack of knowledge about banking system" [18]." The last segment of the sentence appears misplaced within the text, with unnecessary quotation marks. It seems disconnected from the surrounding context and should be revised.</li> </ol> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>The conclusion is appropriate, summarizing key points.</p> <p><b>Future Research:</b></p> <p>The suggestion for future research is commendable but could be elaborated. For example, some specific methodologies can be recommended that could help the assessment of the long-term impact of the PM-KISAN scheme.</p> <p><b>Policy Implications &amp; Limitations:</b></p> <p>These sections are well-structured and informative</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through its rigorous methodology and comprehensive data analysis. The use of established techniques, such as the Rank Based Quotient (RBQ), ensures that the results are both valid and reliable. While the manuscript presents a well-defined hypothesis, it is essential to align its results with relevant literature for a comprehensive understanding of the field. Doing so will enhance the manuscript's technical rigour and contribute valuable insights to the body of knowledge</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are mostly sufficient and cover a broad range of relevant studies, providing a solid foundation for the research.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear and coherent, effectively conveying the research objectives, methods, and findings. Overall, with some revisions for clarity, the manuscript will meet the standards expected in scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This manuscript is well-researched and relevant to current discussions regarding agricultural policy in India. By addressing the above suggestions, the article could present an even more persuasive and policy-relevant analysis of the PM-KISAN scheme, ensuring that it provides a balanced view of both present issues and potential reforms.	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anindita Bhattacharya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>United Kingdom</b>