

**Review Form 3**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JEAI_124616   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Comprehensive Evaluation of Socio-Psychological Paradigms and Economic Metrics among beneficiary farmers of select Centrally Sponsored Agricultural Schemes in Vidarbha Region of Maharashtra</b> |
| Type of the Article      |  |

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

| <u>Compulsory</u> 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>The paper is important because it uses a data-driven approach in assessing these government initiatives' socioeconomic impact and effectiveness on farmers in selected places. The study findings have also revealed successes and challenges among the beneficiary farmers' which can provide significant insights for policymakers. In summary, this work can significantly improve agricultural productivity and sustainability and address regional agricultural needs in Maharashtra.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>  | <p>The manuscript title is not bad but I will suggest the title below:<br/> <b>'Assessing the Socio-Psychological Paradigms and Economic Metrics of Beneficiary Farmers under Centrally Sponsored Agricultural Schemes in Vidarbha, Maharashtra'</b></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 good but needs to be summarized to avoid overwhelming readers with lots of words. Additionally, there are errors in punctuation such as the wrong placement of full stops (.). This can lead to fragments and incomplete sentences and ultimately reduce the quality of the work. These few errors can be found in lines 8 and 11 of the abstract.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>  | <p><b>Yes, the subsections and the structure of the manuscript are good. However, a map of the study region will add more quality to the work. So, I suggest adding a quality map of the study area.</b></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 robustness through its use of an <b>ex post facto research design</b>, which is appropriate for assessing the impacts of pre-existing agricultural schemes on beneficiary farmers. The study employs <b>systematic data collection methods</b> such as structured interviews with a clearly defined sample size of 360 farmers from multiple districts which is good. The statistical analysis and clear objectives for each scheme indicate that the manuscript is technically sound and grounded in established research methodologies.</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>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent because most of the references are dated from 2015 to date.</p>  |   |
| <p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>Yes, the language and coherence of the manuscript are standard and suitable for scholarly communications.</p>  |   |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>   | <p>Overall, the manuscript is good and well-written with sufficient supportive data and can contribute to the body of literature for the journal.</p>   |   |

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | No corrections were suggested   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Salifu Dumbuya</b>   |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Pan African University Institute for Water and Energy Sciences, The Gambia</b> |