



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript is more beneficial for or much to do with the areca nut farmers, the marketing societies and agencies such as Ramcos and Tumcos, and for decision making by policy makers (government), it is an applied research. The quantitative methods used such as compound growth equations and analysis, least square analysis were not clearly presented and explained (references where other researchers/scientists have previously used, etc.). The tables presented were not well understood because they have no legends/notes where the numbers, signs, etc.. are explained – please read other published papers and check the notes below the Tables or check the instruction for authors)). The significant difference was mentioned in the methodology but did not indicated in the results and so on. For scientific value, the manuscript needs improvement.</li> <li>2. The Title does not exactly represent the body of manuscript. The role of marketing agencies was not studied (no variables and parameters measured, no data taken, etc.) even though some sentences mentioned the roles such as providing credits, input factors, insurance etc., in a sub title prior to sub title Results and Discussions, and Conclusion but not studied and discussed. With the methodology presented (variables studied a and parameters measured) the title maybe proposed to be related to ...”Annual growth of Areca nut Marketing agencies in Kamataka.....India.</li> <li>3. The abstract is quite well done in covering the backgrounds, methodology, results and conclusions of the study.</li> <li>4. The structuring of manuscript is not completely appropriate as it has to be, especially with regard to the placement of sub Title <b>The Facilities provided to farmers by marketing societies</b>. The sub title is supposed to be under the results and discussions if the Title of the manuscript is “The role of.....</li> <li>5. The manuscript showed scientific structure in term of (background, objectives, methodologies, results, discussions and conclusions, it is not quite well presented and not covers what indicated in the title. Objective number one was not elaborated in the methodology (maybe questionnaires used to gather the information from farmers in the two marketing agencies studied, etc.), but appeared in conclusions. In my opinion it is scientifically not really correct to be published (there should be a major revision).</li> <li>6. The references may be sufficient for the manuscript since it is quite short. . However, there should be references for the statistical equations and tests used,</li> </ol>	<p>The article is focused on the welfare activities for the farmers which are provided by the marketing agencies. The compound annual growth rate using regression analysis was employed to know the procurement pattern and its growth so that it will be clear to understand the need of the farmers in participation with these marketing agencies which will aid a promising income for their produce.</p> <p>The title of the paper will be changed to <b>A study on growth of procurement of arecanut by different marketing agencies for the benefit of the farmers.</b></p>