

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_118832
Title of the Manuscript:	A comprehensive analysis of the impediments perceived by the members of FPOs in North Bihar
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. We consider that this manuscript contains solid scientific studies, providing the latest information on the development of science, especially on the agriculture study.</p> <p>2. We think the title is quite interesting, but please review the standardized journal writing guidelines, particularly regarding the consistency of capitalization in titles. Then, It is necessary to consider abbreviations in the title that may potentially confuse readers.</p> <p>3. We think that the abstract presented represents the question in question.</p> <p>4-5. Overall, we assess that this writing resembles a short communication. It is shorter in length compared to typical scholarly articles, comprising approximately 5 pages of research content excluding the bibliography. Furthermore, the introduction section is narrated in only 2 paragraphs, with the first paragraph consisting of just 2 core sentences. Furthermore, the results and discussion sections are combined into one, whereas in a scholarly article, it is preferable to separate these two aspects. Thus, the research should focus on elaborating the results first, followed by a discussion of these findings.</p> <p>6. We assess that the references cited by the authors represent a substantial portion of scholarly articles, with the majority of publications being from the last decade.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Minor Revision	
<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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Angkasa Putra
Department, University & Country	Pukyong National University, South Korea