

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_127123
Title of the Manuscript:	Constraints of agripreneurs engaged in value addition of jackfruit in Kerala
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The limitations faced by agribusiness owners who are involved in the value addition of jackfruit a crop that is severely underutilized despite its nutritional and financial potential are clarified in this manuscript which makes a significant contribution to the scientific community. This study offers a thorough analysis that can help stakeholders and policymakers create focused interventions by identifying crop-specific market legal technological and financial barriers. A strong methodological approach to prioritizing constraints is added by using Garretts ranking technique which raises the study's legitimacy. The manuscripts practical relevance and potential to inspire workable solutions for enhancing the jackfruit value chain are greatly appreciated. To make the discussion more applicable it could be enhanced with comparative analysis from other comparable crops or geographical areas.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Constraints of Agripreneurs Engaged in Value Addition of Jackfruit in Kerala," effectively conveys the study's focus on identifying the challenges faced by agripreneurs in the jackfruit value-addition sector in Kerala. It is clear and descriptive, making it suitable for the article. However, if you want to make the title more engaging and reflect the broader significance of the findings, an alternative could be: "Challenges and Opportunities for Agripreneurs in the Jackfruit Value-Addition Sector: Insights from Kerala" This alternative title highlights both the challenges and the potential opportunities, which might attract a wider audience.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The articles abstract is generally thorough offering a concise synopsis of the goal's methods findings and conclusions of the research. It could be enhanced in a few areas though in terms of engagement clarity and completeness. Below are some recommendations. Additions that have been suggested. Include a brief explanation of the study's significance and why the results are significant for Kerala's agricultural industry agribusiness owners and policymakers. For instance, the results offer practical advice that agribusiness owners and legislators can use to overcome the obstacles and realize the full potential of the jackfruit value-addition sector. Methodological Information: Provide a brief explanation of the analytical strategy (Garretts ranking technique) to help readers understand how the constraints were assessed. Scope of Solutions: Although recommendations are mentioned in the conclusion briefly describe the kinds of solutions that are recommended (programs for knowledge enhancement exhibitions and financial assistance).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and organization are generally appropriate and logical in this manuscript. With clearly defined subheadings for Results and Discussions Methodology Introduction and Conclusion it adheres to a standard format appropriate for a scientific article. Still a few edits might make it easier to read and more in line with academic standards. Strengths: 1. Clear Subheadings: The reader can easily navigate the content thanks to clearly defined subheadings such as financial market technological	

Review Form 3

	<p>legal and crop-specific constraints.</p> <p>Data Presentation: To provide clarity and bolster the conversation tables are used to display constraints and their rankings.</p> <p>Sequential Flow: The results are presented in a logical manner beginning with a unit profile before going into detail about particular constraints.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Addition of a Literature Review Section: Including a brief section summarizing relevant studies on jackfruit value addition or similar industries would provide context and highlight the study's uniqueness. Alternatively, expand the introduction to incorporate relevant literature. 2. Separate Discussion Section: The Results and Discussions section combines the two aspects. Separating them could allow for a deeper analysis of the findings and comparisons with previous research. 3. Consistency in Subsections: Ensure that all subsections are equally detailed. For example, the "Legal Constraints" and "Crop-specific Constraints" sections could benefit from slightly more discussion. 4. Conclusion and Recommendations: The Conclusion could be separated into two parts: one summarizing finding and the other providing detailed recommendations. This would improve clarity and focus. 5. Policy Implications: Consider adding a brief subsection highlighting the implications of the findings for policymakers or the jackfruit value-addition industry in Kerala. 	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript uses a methodical approach to identify and analyze constraints in Keralas jackfruit value addition making it technically sound and scientifically sound. The methodology is clearly defined and employs suitable tools such as Garretts ranking technique to efficiently prioritize constraints. The process of gathering data is thoroughly explained guaranteeing the results repeatability and reliability. The conclusions scientific validity is further reinforced by the quantitative evidence that backs up the findings and is presented in an understandable and structured way such as ranking tables. The manuscripts technical soundness is further demonstrated by the results logical interpretation in light of the larger context of value addition and agricultural challenges.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references are generally relevant to the topic and provide a foundation for the research. However, while some references are recent (e.g., Cunningham et al., 2023; Son, 2023), others date back several years, such as Rahman (2017) and Mittal et al. (2018). Including more up-to-date references, especially on jackfruit value addition, MSME challenges, or climate change impacts on agriculture, could enhance the manuscript's relevance and depth. Additionally, some references focus on broad issues like MSMEs and technology, which might not directly connect with jackfruit value addition; consider replacing or supplementing these with studies more specific to the topic.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article is generally clear and appropriate for scholarly communication, but there is room for improvement to enhance its precision and fluency. While the content is understandable, minor grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and inconsistent terminology may slightly detract from its professional tone. Here are a few specific suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consistency in Terminology: Ensure that key terms are used uniformly throughout the manuscript. For example, terms related to "value addition," "MSMEs," and "jackfruit processing" should be standardized. 2. Improvement in Grammar and Syntax: Some sentences have awkward construction or unnecessary complexity. Revising for clarity and conciseness would improve readability. For instance, splitting overly long sentences into shorter, more direct ones can help. 3. Academic Tone: While the manuscript generally adheres to scholarly standards, it could benefit from a more formal tone in certain parts. Avoid conversational or overly general statements. 4. Proofreading: A thorough review for typographical errors, verb tenses, and punctuation would enhance overall quality. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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:	Nerilyn J. Victoria
Department, University & Country	Bulacan Agricultural State College, Philippines