

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_127111
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on status and activities of Farmer Producer Organization of Uttara Kannada District
Type of the Article	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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	I liked about the manuscript because of the focus of the subject which lies on "Farmer Producer Organizations" which is the policy focus of the frontline issues of farming related sectors	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable for the manuscript	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive to have a grip over the topic	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are appropriate.	
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.	Well, in this regard, with great honesty I would say the manuscript does lack in robust and scientificness with the following points under different sections: Abstract: "The present investigation" and "The present study" seems to be redundant, just rephrase the first two statements appropriately. Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide reference with in-text citations for the statement "There are around thirty five farmer producer organizations in Uttar Kannada district" to give authenticity of the fact • The above-mentioned particular statement should have been under subsection "Study area" of section "Materials and Methods" to give a meaning like out of how many FPOs, four FPOs were sampled out • The in-text citations "(Anon-2015)" should have been "(Anonymous, 2015)" • The statements "The ownership of the PO..." and "However, ownership control is always....." seems to be 	

Review Form 3

	<p>redundant, which can be rephrased to make it a single brief manner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the statement before “The main aim of PO.....”, there is this portion “process guidelines for farmer producer organizations-ministry of agriculture”, please check if the sentence is complete or year is missing with a bracket missing The in-text citations “(Anon, 2024)” should have been “(Anonymous, 2024)” “Uttarkannada” should be “Uttar Kannada” <p>Materials and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What was the rationale behind selected these FPOs? As the authors have mentioned “based on active participation of farmers and their functioning”, provide data encompassing the number of farmers participating all of those FPOs present in the Uttar Kannada district Why only Uttar Kannada district was selected? Provide the reasons for it with facts and evidences <p>Results and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under section describing table 2: General information about the selected FPO’s, is it correct to write “fee at 1,250 Rs. per farmer” instead of “Rs 1,250 per farmer”, accordingly check on other denotations related to membership fees Under section describing table 3: in the statement “Raita Kalyana FPO has highest number of visiting farmers (700) regularly.....”, so how come it is regular? Whether they were coming day wise, week-wise, fortnight-wise or monthly basis, please mention that. In that same section, “The main reason behind of some wild edible fruits etc”, here training activities, workshops and field visits also come under extension activities for spreading awareness about the concerned topic (here it’s about honeybees rearing, medicinal plant cultivation and value addition of edible fruits. Inside bracket figures must be expressed upto two decimal points, for eg. (72.00%) instead of (72%), (3.00%) instead of (3%). Wrong in-text citations, for eg. It should have been Saha <i>et al.</i> (2023) instead of Saha <i>et al</i> 2023. <p>Conclusion: Mention about the shortcomings and future scope of the research in two-three lines</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 very too less which is about just eight in number, not enough for the least standards of a journal whose NAAS rating is above 5 (which is 5.17 in 2024). It should be atleast 15 but not less than that.</p> <p>And also the references were not even in the format as prescribed by the journal guidelines</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of English language is fine for understanding barring some common typing mistakes</p>	
<p>Optional/General 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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Debi Kalyan Jayasingh</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Odisha University of Agriculture and Technology, India</p>