

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124616
Title of the Manuscript:	Comprehensive Evaluation of Socio-Psychological Paradigms and Economic Metrics among beneficiary farmers of select Centrally Sponsored Agricultural Schemes in Vidarbha Region of Maharashtra
Type of the Article	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><i>The article is speaking about the perceived benefits from different agricultural development programs. The government has introduced many schemes and programs for the benefit of farmers and development of agriculture but it is important to understand how these schemes are received by the end users.</i></p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p><i>I feel that there is a mismatch between the title and the body of the article</i></p> <p><i>A better title in my opinion will be –</i></p> <p>UNDERSTANDING BENEFICIARIES AND THEIR PERCEPTION ON THE BENEFITS FROM DIFFERENT AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES</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><i>Abstract is lengthy and need to be presented in a crisp way by capturing the complete research presented in the paper.</i></p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p><i>Conclusion is mainly the summary of the paper. It would be better if author can make a few suggestions/ recommendations based on the findings</i></p>	
<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><i>The paper mainly provides the profile of the respondents and their perception on benefits. The study will help in better implementation of schemes and identification of target group.</i></p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p><i>Sufficient</i></p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p><i>There is need for improvement. The paper probably has been taken from some research study. There is need to present it more smoothly and also at some places there is need to take care of the tense.</i></p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The paper is too lengthy though with limited focus. Its length can be reduced to 3000-4000 words.</i> 2. <i>Many sub-sections like age, education, training, land holding size, etc can be reduced. Also, these sections are compiled in Table-6 but presented before Table-1.</i> 3. <i>Author can present the information by bifurcating the tables mainly Table-6 and present information in a certain chronology.</i> 4. <i>The paper provides background about three schemes, the author may present that in a tabular form by highlighting on their inter-relationship and the rationale behind selecting these schemes. It will add value to the paper and reduce length.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>Author may be requested to revise the paper as it adds value to the available literature on the subject through it may be focusing on a very limited aspect of scheme implementation</i> o <i>However, the paper needs to be presented completely in a different manner</i> o <i>Length is to be reduced</i> o <i>Chronology is to be maintained</i> o <i>Some suggestions to be added</i> o <i>Abstract needs to be made more crisp and to the point covering the entire study</i> <p><i>If possible, try to provide the rationale behind selection of these three schemes and present them in tabular form</i></p> 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></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>	<p>No corrections were suggested</p>

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Shalendra</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>India</p>