

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_119161
Title of the Manuscript:	PURCHASING BEHAVIOUR AND SATISFACTION LEVEL OF FARMERS REGARDING GROUNDNUT SEEDS
Type of the 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://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into the purchasing behavior and satisfaction levels of farmers regarding groundnut seeds in Dhoraji Taluka, Rajkot district, Gujarat. This study is significant as it highlights the socio-economic factors affecting seed purchase decisions, which can guide policy-making and interventions to improve agricultural productivity and farmer satisfaction.</p> <p>The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the study. However, a more concise version could be: "Farmers' Purchasing Behaviour and Satisfaction with Groundnut Seeds in Dhoraji Taluka, Gujarat."</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from some reorganization for clarity. The current version is dense and could be broken into shorter sentences for better readability. Additionally, the abstract should briefly mention the key findings to provide a complete overview.</p> <p>The subsections and structure are appropriate, covering introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. However, the results section could be more clearly organized with subheadings for different aspects such as demographics, purchasing behavior, and satisfaction levels.</p> <p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, with a clear methodology and appropriate analytical tools used to interpret the data. However, a more detailed explanation of the statistical methods and their justification would enhance the robustness of the study.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent. The authors have cited relevant studies that provide context to their research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are instances of grammatical errors and awkward phrasing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Sumit Mittal
Department, University & Country	USA