

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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 contains a study about the recent problems faced by farmers in the Farmer Producer Organizations. It could give solutions to anyone involved in the agriculture sector, especially the stakeholders. However, this manuscript has a less significant impact on the advancement of the scientific community since it needs more innovation (just a regular field survey).</p> <p>If it is not a common terminology, please refrain from using abbreviations in the title. The title is still short enough if you put "Farmer Producer Organizations" instead of "FPO"</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive enough. It contains all sections of the manuscript and has been described clearly.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are systematically correct and appropriate for a standard research paper.</p> <p>The manuscript uses a standard scientific method. However, there is a slight contradiction in the data analysis. Friedman is non-parametric, while ANOVA is parametric.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent enough. However, the author should pay attention to how to conduct citations based on the numbering method, as stated in the journal guidelines.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The author used standard written English in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>If possible, please state in the introduction why the authors chose North Bihar as the place of study.</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:	I Gde Adi Suryawan Wangiyana
Department, University & Country	Pendidikan Mandalika University, Indonesia