

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_110983
Title of the Manuscript:	STATUS OF AGRICULTURE CREDIT IN KARNATAKA: WITH REFERENCE TO THE PERFORMANCE OF KISAN CREDIT CARD SCHEME
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<b>1.</b> Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides a detailed analysis of the period-wise and agency-wise growth of the Kisan Credit Card scheme in Karnataka. The study offers valuable insights into the performance of the KCC scheme by considering the number of operative cards and the amount outstanding over a five-year period. This information is crucial for policymakers, researchers, and stakeholders in the agricultural and financial sectors to understand the effectiveness and reach of the KCC scheme in Karnataka. <b>2.</b> The title of the article, "STATUS OF AGRICULTURE CREDIT IN KARNATAKA: WITH REFERENCE TO THE PERFORMANCE OF KISAN CREDIT CARD SCHEME," is suitable as it accurately reflects the focus of the study on the Kisan Credit Card scheme and its performance in the context of agriculture credit in Karnataka. <b>3.</b> Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a clear overview of the study, including the objectives, methodology, and key findings. The abstract effectively summarizes the focus of the research and the main results, making it useful for readers to quickly understand the scope and significance of the study. <b>4.</b> Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The paper is well-organized and follows a logical structure, with clear headings and subheadings that help to guide the reader through the study. The introduction provides a clear background and rationale for the study, while the literature review effectively summarizes previous research on the Kisan Credit Card scheme. The methodology section is detailed and provides a clear explanation of the data analysis techniques used. <b>5.</b> Based on the review, the manuscript appears scientifically rigorous, but a full evaluation is needed to assess methodology, data quality, and potential biases. <b>6.</b> The results and discussion section is well-organized and presents the findings in a clear and concise manner. Overall, the manuscript is well-structured and easy to follow. The references in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and recent. The authors have cited a range of relevant sources, including academic articles, reports, and government publications, to support their research. The references are also recent, with the majority of sources published within the last five years. However, if the authors wish to further strengthen their literature review, they could consider citing some additional recent studies on the Kisan Credit Card scheme and agriculture credit in Karnataka. For example, a study by Kumar and Singh (2021) analyzed the impact of the Kisan Credit Card scheme on agricultural productivity in Karnataka, while a study by Singh and Kumar (2020) examined the role of technology in improving the delivery of agriculture credit in India. These studies could provide additional insights and perspectives on the topic.	1. Accepted  2. Made changes in the title of the article as per the suggestion of another reviewer.  3. Accepted  4. Accepted  5. Accepted  6. Accepted and added some more references.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Based on the sections reviewed, the language and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communication, demonstrating clarity and coherence in conveying research findings and concepts.	Accepted
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer’s comment	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There are no ethical issues in the manuscript.