

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124521
Title of the Manuscript:	An Analysis of Constraints Faced by PM-KISAN Beneficiaries across Southern States of India: Key Issues and Policy Implications
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)
<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 provides valuable insights into the challenges faced by PM-KISAN beneficiaries, a topic that is of significant relevance for policy makers, agricultural economists, and rural development professionals. The detailed analysis of constraints across five southern Indian states using both qualitative and quantitative data, particularly the use of the Rank Based Quotient method, adds scientific rigor to the findings. The study highlights the inadequacy of financial support and the exclusion of tenant farmers, offering actionable policy recommendations. This work contributes to the growing discourse on improving direct benefit transfer schemes in India's agricultural sector and presents compelling evidence for necessary reforms.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article, ***An Analysis of Constraints Faced by PM-KISAN Beneficiaries across Southern States of India: Key Issues and Policy Implications*** is quite suitable for the content of the research. It clearly communicates the focus of the study, which is on analyzing the challenges experienced by beneficiaries of the PM-KISAN scheme in southern India. The title is specific about the geographic scope (southern states) and indicates that the paper will address both key issues and policy implications, aligning with the study's objectives.</p> <p>However, if there is a desire to make the title even more precise, it could potentially include the methodology or sample size to highlight the thoroughness of the study, for example: ***A Rank-Based Quotient Analysis of Constraints Faced by PM-KISAN Beneficiaries across Southern India: Key Issues and Policy Implications***. This would emphasize the analytical approach used.</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>These typically include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Context/Background: Introduction to the problem or issue being addressed. 2. Objective: The main aim or research question. 3. Methods: Brief mention of the methodology or approach used. 4. Key Findings: The most significant results or insights from the research. 5. Conclusions/Implications: How the findings can contribute to policy or practice 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation: Ensure the research gap is clearly identified, and the objective of your study is clearly stated. 2. Methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective: Clearly outline the methodological framework used to collect and analyze data. In this case, you would highlight the Rank-Based Quotient Analysis and any statistical tools employed. • Evaluation: This section should be detailed and transparent, allowing other researchers to replicate your study. Ensure that the sampling methods, sample size, study area, and analysis process are clearly presented. 3. Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective: Present the main findings of the study in a clear and logical manner. Use tables, charts, or graphs as necessary to highlight key constraints faced by PM-KISAN beneficiaries. • Evaluation: Ensure that the results section focuses on significant findings and is presented in a way that is easy to follow. Grouping results thematically or by constraints could be helpful. 4. Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective: Interpret the findings in the context of existing literature. Discuss the broader implications of your results for policymakers and practitioners involved in welfare schemes. • Evaluation: Ensure that the discussion highlights both the strengths and limitations of your study, and suggests potential policy solutions based on your findings. 5. Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective: Summarize the key findings and discuss their relevance to policy. Provide clear recommendations for improving the implementation of PM-KISAN. • Evaluation: This section should briefly recapitulate the major insights and present actionable policy recommendations. 	

Review Form 3

<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 demonstrates scientific correctness and technical soundness by employing a well-established methodology, namely Rank-Based Quotient Analysis (RBQ), to assess the constraints faced by PM-KISAN beneficiaries. The research design is structured around clear objectives and follows a systematic approach, using a robust sample size and appropriate data collection techniques. Additionally, the manuscript provides a thorough review of relevant literature, ensuring that the findings are well contextualized within existing research. The results are presented transparently, and conclusions are drawn based on empirical data, enhancing the reliability and validity of the study.</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 included in the manuscript appear to be sufficient, covering key areas related to PM-KISAN, agricultural extension, and the broader economic context. However, a closer examination of their recency may reveal that some references could benefit from updates. To strengthen the manuscript, consider incorporating more recent studies (from the past 2-3 years) on the impact of PM-KISAN or other similar direct benefit schemes in agriculture. This would ensure the discussion aligns with the most current findings and trends. Specific suggestions could include references to more recent government reports or peer-reviewed articles on agricultural schemes and rural development.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, as the manuscript is clear, concise, and effectively conveys the research objectives and findings. However, there are a few areas where the writing could be improved for better readability and flow. Some minor grammatical adjustments and rephrasing of complex sentences may enhance clarity. Additionally, ensuring consistency in terms of terminology and expression will strengthen the overall communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>-</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>S. Rajaguru</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Gandhigram Rural Institute Deemed to be University, India</p>