

### 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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the constraints faced by various stakeholders in the warehousing system in Telangana, India. By using Garrett's ranking technique, it offers a systematic analysis of the challenges, prioritizing issues for different groups involved. The study's comprehensive approach, covering perspectives from farmers to labourers, makes it particularly useful for policymakers and researchers looking to improve agricultural storage and distribution systems. Its findings can contribute to addressing key issues in the sector.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Constraint Analysis of Stakeholders in Warehousing System in Telangana" is suitable for the article.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provided in the manuscript is not quite comprehensive. And suggestions have been added in file.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is generally appropriate. But there are some areas for improvement: 1. Consider separating Results and Discussion for clarity or use clearer subheadings within the combined section. 2. Add a brief "Limitations of the study" subsection before the Conclusion.	
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.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through its use of an established methodology, Garrett's ranking technique, and a systematic sampling approach. It provides detailed data tables and clear explanations of findings, enhancing reliability. The comprehensive analysis of multiple stakeholder perspectives strengthens the study's validity. These factors collectively contribute to the manuscript's scientific robustness and technical soundness, making it a credible source of information on Telangana's warehousing system constraints.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	More and recent references needed. The latest reference provided in this manuscript is 6 years ago.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Some typos need to check. Provided in the file.	
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Conclusion part can be clearer and more comprehensive, suggestions made in file.	

### 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>Zheng Qin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Beihang University, China</b>