



REPERCUSSIONS OF GST- 2.0 REFORMS ON THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR IN ANDHRA PRADESH, INDIA: A CRITICAL SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

¹M. Sriramulu and ²K. Sankar Reddy

¹Dept. of Commerce, Visvodaya Government Degree College, Venkatagiri, A.P

²Dept. of Commerce, Dr.YSR Government Degree College, Vedurukuppam, A.P.

Abstract

The rollout of the second-generation Goods and Services Tax reforms (GST 2.0) in September 2025 restructured India's indirect tax architecture from a four-slab system into a simplified merit (5%), standard (18%) and demerit (40%) structure, with explicit rate cuts on tractors, harvesting and threshing machinery, bio-pesticides and dairy inputs. This review critically and systematically synthesises 25 peer-reviewed and grey-literature sources published between 2017 and 2026 that examine the interaction between GST (both its original 2017 form and the 2025 recalibration) and the agricultural sector, with a specific analytical lens on Andhra Pradesh (AP). Using a narrative-synthesis and vote-counting method appropriate for a heterogeneous, largely descriptive and non-experimental evidence base, the review identifies five recurring thematic domains: input-cost pass-through, market integration and price transmission, compliance burden on smallholders and agri-MSMEs, interaction with state procurement systems, and the GST 2.0 rationalisation itself. The synthesis finds cautious convergence that GST 2.0's slab compression and targeted exemptions are likely to lower the cost of farm mechanisation and key inputs, while continuing to shift compliance costs downstream. Notwithstanding official estimates that Andhra Pradesh stands to gain materially from GST 2.0 nationally, the review finds a near-complete absence of peer-reviewed, AP-specific, farm-level empirical evidence within the sourced literature — the single AP-focused item in the set is itself a conceptual/policy paper rather than a primary study. The review concludes with a critical appraisal of methodological weaknesses (secondary-data dependence, absence of causal identification, non-standardised outcome measures), and proposes a research agenda for AP-specific quantitative impact assessment.

Keywords: GST 2.0; agriculture; Andhra Pradesh; input costs; systematic review; tax reform; farm economy; Viksit Bharat

1. Introduction

India's Goods and Services Tax (GST), introduced on 1 July 2017, replaced a cascading, multi-layered indirect-tax regime with a destination-based, input-tax-credit (ITC) system intended to unify the national market (Arti et al., 2017; Deshmukh et al., 2022). Agriculture was granted extensive exemptions at the outset — most farm services and many primary commodities remained outside the tax net — yet numerous inputs (machinery, fertiliser intermediates, agro-processing equipment) and downstream value-added products (packaged dairy, processed food) were brought within its ambit, creating an asymmetric burden along the value chain (Kaur, 2017; Singh et al., 2018).

Nearly a decade later, the GST Council enacted a second wave of reform — popularly termed GST 2.0 — effective 22 September 2025, compressing the four-slab structure (5/12/18/28%) into a two-slab merit/standard system (5%/18%) plus a 40% demerit rate for luxury and sin goods, alongside targeted cuts on agricultural machinery and inputs (GST on tractors below 1800cc, harvesting/threshing machinery and composting equipment reduced from 12% to 5%) (Kilaru & Raju, 2025; Nathwani, 2026; Devarajappa, 2025). For Andhra Pradesh specifically, the state government has projected a gain in the order of ₹8,000 crore from the reform package, alongside a state-wide awareness campaign of roughly 65,000 outreach meetings (contemporaneous state policy communications, cited in the supplementary sources below). Whether these macro-level projections translate into measurable relief for AP's predominantly smallholder-dominated agrarian economy is, however, an empirical question that the academic literature has only begun to address.

This review asks three questions: (i) What does the existing peer-reviewed and policy literature report about the mechanisms through which GST 1.0 and 2.0 affect agricultural input costs, output prices and farm incomes in India? (ii) To



Cover Page



what extent does this literature offer AP-specific, quantitatively grounded evidence? (iii) What are the principal methodological limitations of the extant evidence base, and what research agenda follows for a state-level assessment in Andhra Pradesh?

2. Methodology

This review follows a systematic narrative-synthesis protocol adapted from PRISMA principles, appropriate given the heterogeneity of study designs (conceptual reviews, secondary-data analyses, small-sample surveys, and macro-policy commentaries) in the corpus, which precludes formal meta-analysis.

2.1 Corpus and eligibility

The review corpus comprises 25 sources supplied for this review, spanning 2017–2026, drawn from Indian and international journals indexed with Crossref DOIs (e.g., Journal of Development Studies, Journal of Public Affairs, Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management, CABI Reviews) as well as regional and emerging Indian journals covering GST 2.0. Eligibility criteria applied post hoc were: (a) substantive engagement with GST (2017 regime or 2025 reform) and (b) relevance to agriculture, agri-inputs, farm income, rural MSMEs, or state-level (particularly Andhra Pradesh) fiscal/economic impact. All 25 supplied sources met these criteria and were retained; none were excluded, since the corpus was pre-specified by the review's terms of reference rather than derived from an open-ended database search.

2.2 Synthesis method

Because fewer than a third of the sources report primary quantitative estimates suitable for pooling, the review uses (i) a bibliometric characterisation of study type and thematic focus (Table 1), and (ii) a vote-counting narrative synthesis that classifies each theme by the direction of reported effect across contributing sources (Table 2), a method consistent with Cochrane and Campbell Collaboration guidance for reviews of heterogeneous, non-poolable evidence. Where a source's DOI or title indicated the presence of a full quantitative estimate, that estimate is reported; where only the thematic focus could be established, the source is characterised at the level of its stated scope rather than attributed unverified figures.

2.3 Limitations of the corpus itself

Several sources in the reference set (e.g., B.V. Sai Prasad, 2019; Balamurugan, 2019; Chakkalayil, 2018) are published in regional or lower-visibility outlets without open-access full text, constraining independent verification of their specific numerical claims; these are therefore treated at the level of declared scope and cross-referenced against better-documented sources (Singh et al., 2018; Sarkar et al., 2025) wherever their themes overlap.

3. Bibliometric Characterisation of the Reviewed Literature

Table 1 summarises the 25 sources by declared focus, outlet and inferred study design. Two clear temporal clusters emerge: a 2017–2023 cluster addressing GST 1.0's initial impact on agriculture (11 sources), and a 2024–2026 cluster (14 sources) dominated by commentary and early assessment of GST 2.0. Only four sources (Balamurugan, 2019; Patel & Sahu, 2024, 2025; Deshmukh et al., 2022) report primary survey or mixed-method data collection; the remainder are conceptual, descriptive or secondary-data reviews. This skew toward descriptive and conceptual work — rather than field-based causal designs — is itself a first-order finding of the review and is revisited in the critical appraisal (Section 6).

Author(s) & Year	Focus (per source)	Journal / Outlet	Study type (inferred)
Arti et al. (2017)	GST–agriculture impact, general review	Indian J. of Economics & Development	Narrative review



Cover Page



Author(s) & Year	Focus (per source)	Journal / Outlet	Study type (inferred)
Kaur (2017)	GST implications for farm economy	Indian J. of Economics & Development	Conceptual/policy analysis
Naveen Singh et al. (2018)	GST effects on agri-inputs, dairy, agro-processing	Agricultural Economics Research Review	Analytical/cost-of-cultivation
Chakkalayil (2018)	Impact of GST on agriculture	TIJ's Research J. of Commerce & Behavioural Science	Descriptive review
B.V. Sai Prasad (2019)	GST impact on Indian agriculture sector	Regional commerce journal	Descriptive
Balamurugan (2019)	GST effect on agri-input market (survey-based)	Regional commerce journal	Primary survey
Khan, Ansari & Ali (2020)	State-wise post-reform agricultural performance	Journal of Public Affairs	State panel analysis
C. & Kumaraswamy (2021)	Tax reform study on GST (general)	IARJSET	Conceptual
Deshmukh, Mohan & Mohan (2022)	GST implementation – SAP-LAP-Twitter analytics	Global J. of Flexible Systems Mgmt.	Mixed-method / social-media analytics
Nagaraj & Shailaja (2023)	Long-term GST effects across sectors	EPRA Int'l J. Economics, Business & Mgmt.	Secondary-data review
Singh & Prasad (2023)	GST impact on agriculture (assessment)	IJSREM	Descriptive/survey
Ramakumar (2024)	India's agricultural economy 2014–2024: policies & outcomes	Review of Agrarian Studies	Macro policy review
Misra & Basu (2024)	State vs. market roles in agricultural procurement	Journal of Development Studies	Political-economy analysis
Patel & Sahu (2024)	GST impact on small/marginal farmers, Harda district	ShodhKosh	District-level primary survey
Patel & Sahu (2025)	Post-GST agricultural input costs, Harda district	IJRCMS	District-level primary survey
Ankita & Ranjan (2025)	Old vs. new GST across sectors	IJSREM	Comparative descriptive
Chouhan & Sharma (2025)	GST impact on MSMEs (Ahmedabad & Gandhinagar)	J. of Informatics Education & Research	Regional survey
Devarajappa (2025)	GST 2.0 reforms – landmark tax journey	IJLTEMAS	Conceptual/policy
Kilaru & Raju (2025)	GST 2.0 reforms for a new generation	EPRA Int'l J. Economic & Business Review	Conceptual/policy



Cover Page



Author(s) & Year	Focus (per source)	Journal / Outlet	Study type (inferred)
Kilaru & Ganta (2025)	GST 2.0 as fiscal lever for growth — focus on Viksit Andhra	Int'l J. for Multidisciplinary Research	State-focused policy analysis
Lalthanliana (2025)	GST 2.0 structural reforms and business impact	SIJRI	Conceptual/policy
Sarkar et al. (2025)	GST and agriculture: opportunities, constraints, policy	CABI Reviews	Structured thematic review
Uttamsagar (2025)	Next-generation GST 2.0: structural & sectoral impacts	JETIR	Conceptual/policy
Nathwani (2026)	GST 2.0 paradigm: fiscal formalization 2017–2026	Advanced Int'l J. Multidisciplinary Research	Longitudinal structural analysis
Baruah & Vishwanth (2026)	GST framework — agriculture and fishery industries	Int'l J. of Drug Delivery Technology	Descriptive review

4. Thematic Synthesis

4.1 Input-cost pass-through and farm mechanisation

The earliest strand of literature, anchored around the 2017 rollout, documents a mixed short-run effect on input costs. Kaur (2017) and Arti et al. (2017) both note that while GST removed cascading (tax-on-tax) effects on agri-inputs routed through the formal supply chain, several categories of farm machinery and processing equipment initially attracted higher effective rates than under the pre-GST VAT/excise regime, raising upfront capital costs for mechanisation. Singh et al. (2018) provide the most granular account within the corpus, reporting that tax incidence on agro-processing machinery increased under GST even as most primary agricultural services remained exempt, and that dairy processing equipment saw only marginal rate reductions while finished dairy products were newly brought into the tax net — a combination the authors argue could raise consumer prices for processed dairy while leaving farm-gate milk prices largely unaffected.

This picture changes markedly with GST 2.0. Multiple 2025–2026 sources (Kilaru & Raju, 2025; Devarajappa, 2025; Uttamsagar, 2025; Nathwani, 2026) converge on the observation that the September 2025 rate rationalisation directly targets exactly the categories flagged as problematic in the 2017–2018 literature: tractors below 1800cc, harvesting and threshing machinery, and composting equipment were moved from the 12% slab to the 5% merit slab, and GST on bio-pesticides and micronutrients was similarly reduced. Read together, the pre- and post-2.0 literature suggests a self-correcting policy cycle — GST 2.0 appears to directly remediate several of the mechanisation-cost frictions that the earlier academic literature had identified as unresolved under GST 1.0, though none of the 2025–2026 sources in this corpus yet offer ex post farm-level cost data confirming that the intended pass-through has materialised.

4.2 Market integration and price transmission

A second theme concerns whether GST's removal of interstate check-posts and cascading levies improved market integration. Sarkar et al. (2025), the most methodologically explicit review in the corpus, report that GST is associated with improved supply-chain efficiency, reduced interstate trade barriers, and stronger operationalisation of the National Agricultural Market (eNAM), which the authors link to enhanced price transparency and market access for farmers. Ramakumar (2024) situates this within a decade-long macro assessment of Indian agricultural policy (2014–2024), cautioning that aggregate market-integration gains have coexisted with continued volatility in farm-gate prices driven by factors largely orthogonal to GST — procurement policy, minimum support price (MSP) operations, and climatic shocks.



Cover Page



Khan et al. (2020) add a state-wise comparative lens, finding that the post-reform performance of agriculture varies substantially across Indian states, implying that any AP-specific conclusion cannot be safely extrapolated from national averages.

4.3 Compliance burden and smallholder/agri-MSME effects

A recurring critical theme is that GST's compliance architecture — monthly filing, ITC reconciliation, e-way bills — imposes disproportionate costs on smallholders and agri-MSMEs relative to larger agribusiness. Balamurugan's (2019) survey-based study of the agriculture-input market found compliance and documentation burdens to be a salient concern among input dealers and small processors. Deshmukh et al. (2022), using a SAP-LAP framework triangulated with social-media (Twitter) sentiment analysis, similarly identify compliance complexity as a persistent stakeholder grievance well beyond the initial transition period. Two district-level studies from Madhya Pradesh — Patel and Sahu (2024, 2025) — offer the corpus's most granular primary evidence on this theme, examining small and marginal farmers in Harda district and reporting that post-GST input-cost shifts and compliance requirements were unevenly absorbed, with smaller cultivators less able to leverage input tax credit than larger, better-capitalised farms. Chouhan and Sharma (2025), studying MSMEs in Ahmedabad and Gandhinagar (a non-agricultural but structurally comparable MSME population), similarly report compliance burden as a persistent constraint on growth, offering an instructive — if geographically distinct — parallel for AP's agri-MSME and food-processing units.

4.4 Interaction with state procurement and market intervention

Misra and Basu (2024) examine the evolving balance between state procurement mechanisms and market-based price discovery in Indian agriculture, arguing that where state procurement (MSP operations, public distribution linkages) remains active, it partially insulates farmers from both the benefits and costs of GST-driven price transmission. This is a materially important qualifier for Andhra Pradesh, where paddy and select commercial crops are subject to significant state procurement activity: the net welfare effect of GST 2.0 for AP's farmers cannot be inferred from tax-rate changes alone without accounting for the procurement channel, yet none of the sourced literature models this interaction specifically for AP.

4.5 GST 2.0, formalisation, and the Viksit Andhra framing

The only source in the corpus explicitly framed around Andhra Pradesh, Kilaru and Ganta (2025), situates GST 2.0 as a fiscal lever for growth and competitiveness within the state government's 'Viksit Andhra' development narrative, aligned with the national Viksit Bharat @2047 vision. This is corroborated by contemporaneous state-government communications (cited as supplementary sources below), which report an estimated ₹8,000 crore benefit to Andhra Pradesh from the national GST 2.0 package and a large-scale public-awareness campaign. However, Kilaru and Ganta (2025) — consistent with the broader GST 2.0 literature in this corpus (Kilaru & Raju, 2025; Devarajappa, 2025; Uttamsagar, 2025; Lalthanliana, 2025; Nathwani, 2026) — is a conceptual/policy-analytic contribution rather than a primary empirical study; it does not report farm-level survey data, panel estimates, or sector-disaggregated fiscal incidence analysis specific to AP's agricultural economy. This is the review's most consequential finding: the evidentiary chain linking a national fiscal-benefit estimate to actual, on-the-ground outcomes for AP's approximately 62% rural, agriculture-dependent population remains, within this literature, asserted rather than demonstrated.

4.6 Allied sectors: fisheries and formalisation spillovers

Baruah and Vishwanth (2026) extend the discussion to fisheries, a sector of particular relevance to AP's extensive coastline and aquaculture economy, though the available bibliographic record for this source does not permit independent verification of its specific quantitative claims within the scope of this review; it is included here as a scope marker for a theme meriting dedicated follow-up. Nagaraj and Shailaja (2023), Ankita and Ranjan (2025) and C. and Kumaraswamy (2021) address GST's sectoral and cross-sectoral effects more broadly, with agriculture typically treated as one of several



sectors rather than as the primary focus; their inclusion here is to establish that the broader tax-reform literature continues to treat agriculture as comparatively under-examined relative to manufacturing and services.

5. Quantitative Synthesis (Vote-Counting Matrix)

Table 2 presents a vote-counting synthesis across the seven thematic domains identified in Section 4, mapping each theme to its contributing sources, the predominant direction of reported effect, and — critically — whether AP-specific evidence exists within the corpus. This form of synthesis, standard in systematic reviews where study designs are too heterogeneous for meta-analytic pooling, allows a transparent, non-fabricated quantitative overview of where the literature converges, diverges, or is simply silent.

Thematic domain	Sources engaging this theme	Predominant direction reported	AP-specific evidence available?
Input cost pass-through (fertiliser, machinery, seeds, pesticides)	Arti et al. 2017; Kaur 2017; N. Singh et al. 2018; Balamurugan 2019; Patel & Sahu 2024, 2025	Mixed: short-run compliance burden vs. later rate rationalisation relief	No dedicated AP field study; only national/district (Harda, MP) evidence
Farm output prices & market integration (mandis, NAM)	N. Singh et al. 2018; Khan et al. 2020; Sarkar et al. 2025; Ramakumar 2024	Positive — reduced interstate cascading, better logistics	Not directly tested for AP
Compliance burden on smallholders/ MSME agri-processors	Balamurugan 2019; Chouhan & Sharma 2025; Deshmukh et al. 2022; Patel & Sahu 2024	Negative in short run — documentation, ITC mismatch, working-capital lock-in	Extrapolated only; no AP smallholder survey in set
Procurement / state market intervention interaction with GST	Misra & Basu 2024; Ramakumar 2024	Mixed — procurement policy partly insulates farmers from GST pass-through	Not AP-specific
GST 2.0 rate rationalisation (2025 slab simplification)	Kilaru & Raju 2025; Kilaru & Ganta 2025; Devarajappa 2025; Uttamsagar 2025; Lalthanliana 2025; Nathwani 2026	Positive — lower slabs on tractors, machinery, bio-inputs	Kilaru & Ganta (2025) explicitly frames Viksit Andhra
Fishery / allied-sector taxation	Baruah & Vishwanth 2026	Not clearly quantified in title-level review	None
Macro/sectoral formalisation effects relevant to agri value chains	Nagaraj & Shailaja 2023; Ankita & Ranjan 2025; C. & Kumaraswamy 2021	Positive on formal-sector metrics; agriculture under-represented	None



The matrix makes the review's central quantitative conclusion visible at a glance: across all seven thematic domains, only one (GST 2.0 rate rationalisation) has any direct AP-linked source, and even that source is conceptual rather than empirical. For the remaining six domains — including input-cost pass-through, market integration, compliance burden, and the procurement interaction — the corpus contains no AP-disaggregated evidence at all. This is a gap, not a finding of 'no effect'; the absence of data should not be read as evidence of absence of impact.

6. Critical Appraisal of the Evidence Base

6.1 Study design and internal validity

Of the 25 sources, the overwhelming majority (21 of 25, per Table 1) are conceptual, descriptive, or secondary-data reviews rather than studies employing a causal-identification strategy (difference-in-differences, regression discontinuity, or instrumental-variable designs) capable of isolating GST's effect from confounding factors such as monsoon variability, MSP revisions, global commodity-price cycles, and state-specific agricultural schemes. Only Balamurugan (2019), Deshmukh et al. (2022), and Patel and Sahu (2024, 2025) report primary data collection, and even these rely on cross-sectional survey or sentiment-analysis designs rather than panel data with pre/post-reform comparison groups. This substantially limits the strength of causal claims that can be drawn from the literature as a whole.

6.2 Recency and outlet quality

A notable share of the GST 2.0-specific sources (Kilaru & Raju, 2025; Devarajappa, 2025; Lalthanliana, 2025; Uttamsagar, 2025; Nathwani, 2026) were published within months of the reform itself (September 2025 onward), in emerging or lower-tier journals not yet indexed in major citation databases (Scopus/Web of Science coverage could not be confirmed for several outlets). This is expected given the recency of GST 2.0, but it means the 2025–2026 cluster should be read as early conceptual response rather than settled, peer-consolidated knowledge; conclusions drawn from it warrant proportionate caution pending replication in higher-tier outlets over the next 2–3 years.

6.3 Geographic and sectoral generalisability

The primary-data studies that do exist in the corpus (Patel & Sahu, 2024, 2025) are located in Harda district, Madhya Pradesh — a rainfed, soybean/wheat-dominated agro-ecology structurally different from AP's irrigated paddy, aquaculture, and horticulture-heavy economy. Extrapolating their findings to AP therefore carries substantial external-validity risk. Similarly, Khan et al. (2020) explicitly demonstrate state-wise heterogeneity in post-reform agricultural performance, which itself argues against treating any single-state or national-average finding as representative of AP.

6.4 Publication and framing bias

Several 2025–2026 sources (Kilaru & Raju, 2025; Kilaru & Ganta, 2025; Devarajappa, 2025) engage explicitly with government-aligned 'Viksit Bharat'/'Viksit Andhra' policy framing, which — while not disqualifying — raises the possibility of confirmatory rather than adversarial framing toward the reform's expected benefits. A critical review should note that none of the sourced GST 2.0 literature in this corpus reports a counterfactual or a negative/null finding; this pattern is more consistent with an emerging, favourably-selected commentary literature than with a fully adjudicated empirical consensus.

7. Andhra Pradesh: Synthesising the Available Evidence

Bringing together Sections 4–6, three propositions can be responsibly stated for Andhra Pradesh on the basis of this literature, with appropriate qualification:

- Mechanisation-cost relief is plausible but unverified at farm level. GST 2.0's targeted cuts on tractors, harvesting/threshing machinery and bio-inputs (Kilaru & Raju, 2025; Devarajappa, 2025) directly address cost



Cover Page



frictions documented in the earlier national literature (Singh et al., 2018; Kaur, 2017). Whether AP's tractor and machinery dealers and smallholders have realised this relief has not yet been measured within this corpus.

- The state-level fiscal-gain estimate (~₹8,000 crore) is a macro-fiscal projection, not a farm-income estimate. It reflects aggregate consumption and revenue effects across all sectors, not a disaggregated agricultural-sector or rural-household incidence analysis; treating it as evidence of farmer-level benefit would overstate what the source material supports.
- Procurement-channel insulation may mute both gains and losses for AP's paddy economy specifically. Following Misra and Basu (2024), the extent to which MSP-linked procurement buffers AP's dominant paddy sector from GST-driven price transmission is an open, AP-specific empirical question that none of the reviewed sources address directly.

8. Research Gaps and Agenda

This review identifies the following priority gaps for future AP-focused research, several of which extend directly from the vote-counting matrix in Table 2:

- A panel/difference-in-differences study of AP farm-gate input and output prices spanning the GST 2.0 transition (pre-September 2025 vs. post), disaggregated by crop (paddy, cotton, chilli, horticulture, aquaculture).
- A district-stratified primary survey of AP smallholders' ITC utilisation and compliance cost, comparable in design to Patel and Sahu (2024, 2025) but adapted to AP's agro-ecological and land-holding structure.
- Fiscal-incidence modelling that separates GST 2.0's aggregate state revenue effect (the ₹8,000 crore figure) into sector- and household-level incidence, distinguishing agricultural producers, agri-processors, and rural consumers.
- A dedicated empirical study of AP's fisheries and aquaculture value chain under GST 2.0, extending the scope-level observations in Baruah and Vishwanth (2026).
- Explicit modelling of the MSP-procurement/GST interaction for AP paddy, following the conceptual lead of Misra and Basu (2024) and Ramakumar (2024).

9. Policy Implications

For policymakers, the synthesis suggests that GST 2.0's design — lower rates on mechanisation and bio-inputs — is directionally well-aligned with the input-cost concerns documented in the pre-2.0 literature, and the state's public-awareness campaign (65,000 planned outreach meetings, per contemporaneous state communications) is a reasonable complementary measure given the documented compliance-burden theme in Section 4.3. However, the near-total absence of AP-specific quantitative evidence in the reviewed literature counsels against relying on national or cross-state findings to certify success for AP's agricultural sector. Independent, state-commissioned monitoring — ideally a pre-registered panel survey — would substantially strengthen the evidentiary basis for future policy claims.

10. Limitations of This Review

This review is bounded by the pre-specified 25-source corpus rather than an open-ended systematic database search; it is therefore a critical synthesis of a defined literature set rather than an exhaustive systematic review in the strictest PRISMA sense. Several sources (regional/lower-visibility outlets) could not be independently verified beyond their bibliographic record and declared scope, and are treated with corresponding caution throughout. Where AP-specific quantitative facts were needed to contextualise the discussion (e.g., the ₹8,000 crore state-benefit estimate) and were not present in the 25 academic sources, clearly-labelled supplementary government/press sources have been used and are listed separately from the primary reference list.



Cover Page



11. Conclusion

The reviewed literature offers a coherent, if largely conceptual, account of how GST — first in 2017 and now via the 2025 GST 2.0 recalibration — has interacted with Indian agriculture: reducing cascading taxation and improving market integration on one hand, while shifting compliance costs onto smallholders and agri-MSMEs on the other, with GST 2.0's targeted rate cuts on machinery and bio-inputs directly responsive to earlier-documented frictions. For Andhra Pradesh specifically, however, this review's central and most policy-relevant finding is an evidentiary gap: beyond a single conceptual policy paper (Kilaru & Ganta, 2025) and macro-fiscal projections from state communications, the peer-reviewed literature sourced for this review contains no farm-level, empirically grounded assessment of GST 2.0's effect on AP's agricultural sector. Closing this gap — through panel-based price and income studies, smallholder compliance surveys, and explicit modelling of the procurement-GST interaction — should be the immediate priority for researchers and policymakers seeking to substantiate claims about GST 2.0's benefits for Andhra Pradesh's farmers.

References

1. Arti, Kanwal, V., Pandey, D., Rai, C., & Lal, P. (2017). Impact of GST on agriculture: A review. *Indian Journal of Economics and Development*, 13, 65. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2322-0430.2017.00041.5>
2. Nagaraj, & Shailaja, M. L. (2023). Assessing the long-term effects of GST on chosen sectors in the Indian economy. *EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra14330>
3. Ankita, A., & Ranjan, R. (2025). Impact of new GST with old GST in all sector in India. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.55041/ijserem53055>
4. B.V., S. P. (2019). Impact of GST on Indian agriculture sector. [Regional commerce journal], 21, 131–136.
5. Balamurugan, L. (2019). Effect of GST on agriculture-input market in India (A survey based hypothetical study). [Regional commerce journal], 22, 1148–1158.
6. Baruah, K., & Gy, V. (2026). GST framework and its impact on agricultural and fishery industries. *International Journal of Drug Delivery Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.25258/ijddt.16.49s.84>
7. C., V. K., & Kumaraswamy, M. (2021). Taxes reforms in India — A study on Goods and Services Tax. *IARJSET*. <https://doi.org/10.17148/iarjset.2021.81216>
8. Chakkalayil, B. J. M. (2018). Impact of Goods and Service Tax on agriculture. *TII's Research Journal of Commerce & Behavioural Science — RJCBS*, 7.
9. Chouhan, D., & Sharma, N. (2025). Impact of GST implementation on MSMEs in Ahmedabad and Gandhinagar: Challenges, compliance, and growth opportunities. *Journal of Informatics Education and Research*. <https://doi.org/10.52783/jier.v5i2.2663>
10. Deshmukh, A., Mohan, A., & Mohan, I. (2022). Goods and Services Tax (GST) implementation in India: A SAP–LAP–Twitter analytic perspective. *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, 23, 165–183. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40171-021-00297-3>
11. Kaur, J. (2017). GST and its implications on farm economy. *Indian Journal of Economics and Development*, 13, 74–78. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2322-0430.2017.00043.9>
12. Khan, W., Ansari, S. A., & Ali, T. (2020). Economic reforms and agriculture in India: A state-wise analysis of post-reforms period. *Journal of Public Affairs*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2390>
13. Kilaru, Y., & Raju, G. S. (2025). GST 2.0 reforms for a new generation: Lighter on the pocket, brighter for the future. *EPRA International Journal of Economic and Business Review*. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra24548>
14. Kilaru, Y., & Ganta, S. (2025). GST 2.0 reforms: A fiscal lever for growth and competitiveness in the era of Viksit Bharat with a focus on Viksit Andhra. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i05.58018>
15. Lalthanliana, S. (2025). GST 2.0: Assessing structural reforms and their impact on businesses in India. *Scriptora International Journal of Research and Innovation (SIJRI)*. <https://doi.org/10.65579/sijri.2025.v1i3.07>
16. Misra, K., & Basu, D. (2024). To reform and to procure: An analysis of the role of the state and the market in Indian agriculture. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 60, 724–744. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2024.2312845>



17. Nathwani, D. (2026). The GST 2.0 paradigm: A structural analysis of fiscal formalization and economic integration in India (2017–2026). *Advanced International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*. <https://doi.org/10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i02.1291>
18. Patel, R., & Sahu, D. J. (2025). Post-GST shifts in agricultural input costs: Evidence from Harda district. *International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.38193/ijrcms.2025.7438>
19. Patel, R., & Sahu, J. (2024). Evaluation of GST's impact on small and marginal farmers in Harda district. *ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts*. <https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i6.2024.6303>
20. Ramakumar, R. (2024). India's agricultural economy, 2014 to 2024: Policies and outcomes. *Review of Agrarian Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.25003/ras.14.01.0004>
21. Sarkar, S., Begum, L., Khan, M., & Saikia, M. (2025). GST and the agricultural sector in India: A review of opportunities, constraints, and policy imperatives. *CABI Reviews*. <https://doi.org/10.1079/cabireviews.2025.0075>
22. Singh, P., & Prasad, P. (2023). A study: Assessing impact of Goods and Services Tax on agriculture. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.55041/ijsrem17701>
23. Singh, N. P., Bisen, J., V. P., & A. K. S. (2018). GST in India: Reflections from food and agriculture. *Agricultural Economics Research Review*, 31, 175–185. <https://doi.org/10.5958/0974-0279.2018.00035.6>
24. Sn., D. (2025). A study on the reforms of GST 2.0 — A landmark in India's tax journey. *International Journal of Latest Technology in Engineering Management & Applied Science*. <https://doi.org/10.51583/ijltemas.2025.1409000027>
25. Uttamsagar, K. (2025). Next generation GST 2.0 in India: Structural reforms, sectoral impacts and socio-economic implications. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*. <https://doi.org/10.56975/jetir.v12i10.571206>
26. Supplementary Policy/Grey-Literature Sources
27. *Used only to contextualise AP-specific fiscal figures not present in the 25-source academic corpus (see Section 10, Limitations); these are official government communications, not peer-reviewed evidence, and are cited separately for transparency.*
28. Press Information Bureau, Government of India. (2025, September). GST reforms: Boosting growth and competitiveness for Andhra Pradesh. <https://www.pib.gov.in>
29. News on Air / All India Radio. (2025, September 23). Andhra Pradesh CM Chandrababu Naidu says new GST 2.0 reforms will boost 'Make in India' initiative. <https://www.newsonair.gov.in>
30. News on Air / All India Radio. (2025, September 29). GST Bachat Utsav launched by PM Modi benefits all sections of society. <https://www.newsonair.gov.in>
31. News on Air / All India Radio. (2025, September 7). Next Gen GST will benefit agriculture sector and farmers: Shivraj Singh. <https://www.newsonair.gov.in>