

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_78274
Title of the Manuscript:	Social Impact of Primary Agricultural Co-operative Societies (PACS) in Nadia District of West Bengal
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. This manuscript is an interesting application of grass-rooted survey dataset. But it has to be said that it is more like a report rather than an academic paper. I would suggest citing more literature on the organisation of agricultural production. In particular, I would recommend that the authors review the relevant research literature on cooperatives in the Nordic, China, Southeast Asian and other regions in detail.</p> <p>2. The subject of this paper is “Primary Agricultural Co-operative Societies”. However, this paper does not go into detail about the development of primary cooperatives in West Bengal. The meaning of the word 'primary' is ambiguous. Although, as a researcher in agricultural economics, I know what the author means. But I guess that this article can not to be understood by a wider audience. So, I would strongly recommend that the authors include a note on Primary Agricultural Co-operative Societies in West Bengal.</p> <p>3.As far as I know, West Bengal has special political peculiarities(Left-wing parties). This also impact the development of agricultural cooperative in West Bengal. I wish the author had given more details about the special political background and the development of agricultural cooperatives in West Bengal.</p> <p>4. About the statistical analysis. The results of the statistical analysis in this paper are numerous, however, some of them lack structure. I would suggest that the authors add text to analysis the results and reduce some of the descriptive Tables/Figures.</p> <p>5. In summary, I think this paper needs to add a great content on introduction, literature review, analysis of results.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>6. Of course, if the author wishes. I would suggest a more detailed explanation of how the sample was selected. For example, how the cooperatives were selected, 290 members as a percentage of those in the cooperative, etc.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>This article tends to be more of a descriptive paper. I think this article uses a very interesting dataset. I would have liked the authors to have conducted more specific research, for example, how cooperatives have improved the status of women in decision-making, how cooperatives have changed education, etc. This is, of course, something that needs to be done in the next paper.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fang Da
Department, University & Country	Peking University, China