

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_95207
Title of the Manuscript:	Gauging the Role of Agricultural Marketing in Indian Agribusiness
Type of the Article	Review 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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Abstract: -The abstract needs to be rewritten or restructured. This is a review study or perhaps, a synthesis report. Hence, the abstract must be written clearly to capture the following details: A brief introduction or background to the subject, state the main aim/specific objective (s) of the study, main methodology or approach in analysing literature, summary of the main findings and a concluding sentence which captures the contribution of this study to existing body of knowledge or perhaps, a recommendation. These must be done in a word range of 200-250 words. The abstract is the engine of the work and must be drafted to coax or attract readers to read further. -The current abstract unfortunately lacks all the relevant details.</p> <p>Keywords: -Authors could consider replacing keywords that has already been stated in the title and introduce new words that will give the paper more audience.</p> <p>Introduction: -I humbly suggest authors integrate or link key concepts (i.e., agriculture, agribusiness, agric. Marketing and so on) highlighted in this study to some UN Sustainable Development Goals to enrich the literature.</p> <p>Section 1.3: -Authors can commence the section by giving research progress; thus, works done already which are in line with the scope of this study from a global perspective, narrowed down to the study area. What's known about the topic and what's unknown, yet, important to be studied that is driving the main aim/specific objectives of this study, coupled with the significance or essence of this study to key industrial players, policy makers and the international resarch community. -The main aim must be in just a sentence, followed by the specific objectives presented in bulletin format.</p> <p>Literature review: -Lines 143-247: It would have appropriate to have a conceptual or theoretical framework to guide readers on a clear roadmap for this study. I humbly suggest the authors to integrate a framework (model that highlights this study's study area, main concepts/theories, objectives, prospects and constraints, for this study with a description in that regard. -Authors should make clear the opportunities, research progress in relation to the study's scope, among other parameters clear.</p> <p>Methodology: Lines 252-254: Authors need to support this by citing a source to back this. Which current literature employed similar techniques in gathering information? -Again, authors need to justify how standardized this approach is in the collection and analysis of data. -Was data/information collected subjected to content analysis? -Did authors CONDUCT a thorough systematic literature review (SLR), if so how many papers, database engines and type of paper were sought? -Authors need to throw more light or extend the methodology aspect. Sub-sections/headers under the methodolog could be created to highlight the study area, data collection/research strategies used, sampling size/fraction and procedure, data analysis and so on. -How did they arrive at a sample size of 152? How representation is this number in drawing general conclusions? -Who were the target population? -How did the authors deal with bias or partial judgements? -What probabilistic sampling technique was used: convenient, random, snowball, purposive etc? Choices must be justified briefly and backed with references.</p> <p>Results: -This line must be moved to the methodology section. Authors need to give a brief info. About the type of correlation used and support this with mathematical expressions, along with interpretation of correlation values/parameters.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>-Figure 1: Authors should check the spellings of some words. Kindly correct the spelling of 'Highly Insignificcant' in Fig. 1.</p> <p>-It is inappropriate in scientific research/papers to repeat information in tables in different format like what is presented in Fig.1 which is captured in Table 1 column 3. Authors need to remove Fig.1 or delete column 3 (i.e., Percent) of Table 1.</p> <p>-Same for Table 2 and Fig.2</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>-Lines 327-350: Authors failed to liaise or compare the results of this study to existing literature or previous studies conducted elsewhere. Which aspects of their results agree/support existing literature and which aspects does not support existing literature? What could be the differences in results variations if any?</p> <p>-Again, authors failed to critically discuss the results obtained, in relation to local and external factors that could be integrated to enhance the discussion aspect.</p> <p>-Organization of the results and discussion sections must be ordered or structured according to how the research objectives were ordered or presented for coherence/consistency.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>-It could be developed in paragraphs to present the main objectives, summarised key findings, limitations of this study driving which could potentially drive future or further studies, as well as the significance or importance of the study findings to key proponents.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Other Comments:</p> <p>-Major grammatical defects and syntax errors were identified throughout the manuscript. I humbly suggest authors seek for the help of someone with command over English to revised or improve the proficiency level of the paper.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is generally informative and has the necessary ingredients to be considered for publication. However, there are some major issues with the paper which I humbly suggest the authors to consider or pay critical attention to, to improve the proficiency and scientific nature/robustness of the manuscript.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Isaac Sarfo
Department, University & Country	Research Institute for History of Science and Technology, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, China