

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_87665
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE AND CONSTRAINTS FACED BY THE FARMER PRODUCER ORGANIZATION ON FARMERS INCOME IN KURNOOL DISTRICT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The article does not cite most of the sources from the References section. In the text, there are links to only two sources. Therefore, there is no answer to how exactly this literature is used in the study. Link (Chander 2019) is used in the text of the article, but there is no corresponding source in the References section.</li> <li>The Introduction section uses references to sources for 2007 and 2010, which are not actual to the current state of research.</li> <li>The Introduction section provides some information on the activities of the FPO, but there is no link to the relevant source of information.</li> <li>The first task of the study is: "To determine the knowledge of the respondents of beneficiaries and non beneficiaries of FPO". But what is t." subject of this knowledge? The content of the second task of the study should also be clarified.</li> <li>The gradation of the scale in Table 1 in content does not correspond to the wording of the questions, which violates the correctness of the results. It needs to either adapt the scale to the questions or change the wording of the questions themselves.</li> <li>In describing Table 2, the criteria by which respondents were divided into categories with low, medium, and high levels of knowledge should be indicated. This distribution is not obvious from previous results.</li> <li>The description of the results given after tables 1-4 duplicates the data provided in them and therefore does not contain any new information. There is no discussion of the results.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The article does not specify the period when as conducted.</li> <li>The Conclusion section provides only briefly duplicated results. The article will be better if it indicates the practical significance of the results and potential beneficiaries of the study.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Svitlana Grygoruk
Department, University & Country	Khmelnyskyi National University, Ukraine