

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_116844
Title of the Manuscript:	PRODUCTION AND MARKETING CHALLENGES OF ARECA GROWERS OF TOTA UTPANNAGALA MARATA SAHAKARA SANGHA NIYAMIT (TUMCOS) IN DAVANAGERE DISTRICT OF KARNATAKA
Type of the Article	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://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it sheds light on the specific challenges faced by arecanut growers in Karnataka's Davanagere district. By analyzing constraints for both cooperative members and non-members, the study provides actionable insights for policymakers and researchers aiming to improve agricultural productivity and market access 2. Consider "Challenges in Areca Production and Marketing: A Study of TUMCOS Growers in Davanagere, Karnataka" and "Addressing Production and Marketing Constraints of Arecanut Growers: Insights from TUMCOS in Davanagere, Karnataka" for title revision. 3. Minor phrasing is needed to fulfil the scientific requirements. 4. Yes, overall, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate. Additionally, the use of subsections within the Results and Discussion section further enhances clarity by categorizing constraints and suggestions according to production, financial, and marketing aspects. This organization facilitates readability and comprehension for readers, making the manuscript accessible and easy to navigate. 5. The research follows a systematic approach, employing appropriate methods such as sampling techniques and personal interviews for data collection. The results are presented clearly, supported by statistical analysis, and the discussion provides a logical interpretation of the findings in relation to the research objectives 6. The references are sufficient and recent but the references are no where quoted/cited in the manuscript. <p>Implementing the improvements given in the Reviewer's comment will enhance the clarity, depth, and impact of the article, making it more robust and informative for readers and stakeholders.</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 and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>- Here are detailed suggestions for improvements in each section of the article.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mention the statistical tools or analysis methods used in the study to add depth to the abstract. 2. While the constraints are listed, briefly highlight the most critical finding or a standout statistic to emphasize the importance of the results. 3. Ensure the abstract remains concise while still covering all key aspects of the study. <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incorporate recent statistics on arecanut production and economic data to strengthen the context. 2. Clearly state the research gaps the study aims to fill, linking them to the broader literature and existing studies. 3. Clearly state the specific objectives or research questions the study aims to address. <p>Materials and Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Provide a brief overview of the topics or specific questions covered during the personal interviews to give more context to the data collection process. 5. Justify the sample size and selection process in more detail, explaining why 60 members and 60 non-members were chosen. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>6. Specify the statistical methods or analytical techniques used to analyze the data, ensuring transparency in the research process.</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a deeper analysis of why certain constraints are more significant for TUMCOS members versus non-members. Discuss potential reasons and implications. 2. Compare findings with previous studies or existing literature to highlight similarities or differences and add context. No where the references mentioned were included in the article. 3. Discuss the broader implications of the findings for arecanut growers, policymakers, and stakeholders. 4. Consider using additional visual aids like graphs or charts to complement the tables and make data interpretation easier. <p>Conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suggest specific policy changes or programs that could address the identified challenges, citing examples of successful interventions in similar contexts. 2. Provide a more detailed action plan for how the government or TUMCOS could implement the recommendations. 3. Mention areas for future research that could build on the findings of this study, addressing any limitations or gaps. 	
--	--	--

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:	S. Ragnath
Department, University & Country	Imayam Institute of Agriculture & Technology, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India