



# Agricultural Productivity and Resilience to External Shocks: an empirical study of selected CAREC countries

Dil Rahut  
Asian Development Bank Institute  
Tokyo, Japan  
April, 2022

# Contribution

- Very interesting and well written paper
- Important for Food Security and SDGs Zero Hunger Goal
- Empirically explores the agricultural resilience of selected CAREC countries to external shocks based on assessing changes in their agricultural Total Factor Productivity (TFP).
- Covers eight CAREC countries as Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Pakistan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan.
- Macro-level datasets from the FAO, World Bank, and National statistics of the selected CAREC countries to estimate the TFP indices.
- Productivity analysis reveals that all the eight CAREC countries had positive average agricultural TFP growth for the 20 years but results vary across the 20 years and among the countries.

# Abstract



- Merge the first two sentences of the abstract and elaborate more clearly and effectively.
- Second sentence of abstract is too long.
- Try to merge these three sentences in a single sentence, make them comparable and easy to understand. You may explain this comparison (if required) study objective in start of abstract.” Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan maintained agriculture resilience to the global financial crisis staying robust or adaptable with their TFP composition. Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan maintained their agricultural resilience during the global pandemic. Only Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan showed robust agricultural resilience during both shocks.”
- It would be better if abstract include methodology/data and a bit of findings, avoiding long discussion about CAREC countries.

# Introduction



1. Importantly, the author should provide reference to some reports or internal publication while discussing the agriculture related characteristics of CAREC countries.
2. “However, the results vary across the 20 years and among the countries. Countries also differ in their **reviled** resilience of the agriculture sectors to shocks both among themselves and between the two shocks.” What does reviled mean here?
3. It seems from the first page of introduction that the paper is about land reforms in CAREC countries. Rather, it should discuss agriculture productivity and then formulate a debate that goes around shocks.
4. Objective and contribution

# Conceptual Framework

- In the section “CONCEPTUAL AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK” explanation of resilience could be re-arranged, there are repetitions.
- Connection of resilience with TFP is not clearly established.
- Authors may add the justification of decomposition of TFP to achieve study objectives.
- Section on conceptual and analytical framework mentioned various concepts but it would be nice to build the connection from conceptual to analytical.

# Conclusion

1. In methodology section, it mention that the paper uses the Malmquist productivity index through DEA, however, this is not reflected explicitly in the abstract.
2. Link between Färe et al. (1994) and Zawalińska et al. (2021) could be elaborated.
3. Findings should be compared with other publications
4. Discussion empirical findings could be strengthened
5. Implications of TFP change on resilience to shocks
6. Conclusion and recommendations could be backed using empirical results

