

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_123081</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessing the Operational Constraints of Direct Benefit Transfers: An Empirical Investigation of PM-KISAN scheme of India</b>
Type of the Article	

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	PM Kisan scheme started in 2019 by our Prime Minister provides income support of Rs.6000 per year for small and marginal farmers. Considering the amount and the time spent behind this imitative it is important to study the various aspects of scheme. Studying the constraints of the PM-KISAN scheme is crucial for improving its overall effectiveness and impact. By understanding the challenges, policy makers can identify the areas where scheme is falling short and carryout necessary actions to better serve the intended beneficiaries.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the article title is apt	
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. The correction is that – the last sentence The findings are essential for enhancing the PM-KISAN scheme and improving its impact on the livelihoods of Indian farmers may be deleted or it may be combined with the previous sentence as to avoid duplication of the same meaning.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes appropriate	
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.	The study has clearly defined objective and the researcher has conducted the survey following all the necessary criteria like sampling design, development of questionnaire and also the survey was conducted in two states as they have highest beneficiaries. The methodology was also clearly written and the garret technique used is statistically sound. The findings of the research also have a greater impact on the effectiveness of PMKISAN scheme. The writing of the research article was also technically sound and clear. Hence this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes sufficient, the citation of the study by savitha et.al was not very apt as the study conducted was on livelihood systems and not on direct benefit transfer.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes it is perfectly apt	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	As the title says assessing the operational constraints, indicate the same in the article text wherever needed as only operational constraints were studied.	

#### 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Review Form 3

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Boppa Jagadeeswari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>PJTSAU, India</b>