

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_120599
Title of the Manuscript:	Constraint Analysis of Stakeholders in Warehousing System in Telangana
Type of the Article	Original 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Definitely, this research is useful for the scientific community and the agricultural sector. Due to the fact that the warehouse problems have been identified and prioritized. Of course, considering that this manuscript was made especially for a specific region, it is necessary to be tested and researched in other samples and regions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is good, but I think this title is better: "Identification and Classification of constraints and Problems of Warehousing System. Case Study: Telangana Stakeholders"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, the abstract is good, but in my opinion, it is better to observe the standard division in it.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are appropriate.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I don't have a special style. It's just that stating the problem is not enough, but what is certain is that the variables are well chosen, the method is appropriate, and the selected community is appropriate and accessible.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =	It seems that there are not enough references and even the selected few are not completely up to date. It is also necessary to mention all the references used in the text (such as the 2024 brochure used in the second line of the introduction) as references at the end of the complete manuscript.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I think, it is suitable.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Farzad Mirshamsi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Islamic Azad University, Iran</b>