

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	Studies on status and activities of Farmer Producer Organization of Uttara Kannada District

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>

Review Form 3

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 idea of undertaking micro studies to assess the impact of FPOs is a good concept. However, the new ideas propositioned in the article need to be explained in detail e.g. the home garden system. The major FPO works in this area but the concept has not been explained and how this concept can have the efficacy for FPOs in different parts of the country as well.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title needs further addition: An analytical study to understand ground of FPOs in UK.	
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.	Abstract is fine.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Sub-sections and structure of manuscript needs further elaboration. It is talking about UK or Uttar Kannada so some context about the nature of agriculture pattern in UK should be provided to set the context for formation of FPOs. Besides the home garden system needs to be explained in detail. Literature review has not been included, and it needs to be incorporated specifically literature pertaining to Uttar Kannada.	
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.	It is not Department of Agriculture, but Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare. Proper nomenclature needs to be used, especially when we are taking about the government departments. Apart from this the manuscript has originality of an idea but it has not explored it further to create a template for reference for other geographical areas where plantation crops are grown. It would have been insightful if a comparison with Kerala FPOs undertaken to provide a contrast or a point of commonality.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	References seem to have been done in a hurry, there is no organization or institution known as AFEDA, it is APEDA and each of the documents of government institutions these days are properly indexed and it has not been shown this way. Same is the case with NABARD reference. All the NABARD reference online are available through the writersadda platform and there is a proper indexation. References have not been arranged chronologically, either in descending or ascending order. More references need to be included. There is a copious volume of work available on FPOs especially from the government sector in Karnataka.	
Minor REVISION comments	Language is fine.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nalin Ri
Department, University & Country	Jain University, India