

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_95291
Title of the Manuscript:	Okra Supply Chain: A Case Study of Vadodara City of Gujarat
Type of the Article	Short 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes it is because the manuscript focused on efficiency of marketing . It has policy implications, i.e., lesser the number of intermediaries higher will be marketing efficiency. No. The title of the article should be “ Impact of Okra Supply Chain on Market Efficiency”. The Abstract should be re-written. The sample selected is 45 (15 whole sellers, 15 retailers, 6 commission agents, 6 traders and 3 private companies). But it is mentioned as 50.. Year of study is missing. Under results the most efficient channel is mentioned as Channel I . But the study concluded that Channel 5 is most efficient. Under Introduction sub-section Problem statement and hypotheses are missing. Yes because the effect of supply chain of Okra on market efficiency is studied. The references are not sufficient. Some more existing studies should be reviewed and come out with the differences or similarities. The study used Acharya Approach to measure market efficiency of Okra supply chain. Are the marketing channels of present study same or different? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Typing errors should be corrected.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Self contradicting statements should be corrected.. At one place it is mentioned that Channel I is most efficient and at other place Channel 5 as most efficient. The sample selection is mentioned as 50 but actually it is 45 only.	

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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Syed Ali
Department, University & Country	India