

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125611
Title of the Manuscript:	Value Chain Analysis of Apple in Shimla District of Himachal Pradesh
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The study analyzed the business value chain of Apple in Shimla District of Himachal Pradesh during the year 2021 and 2022, relying solely on the perspectives of traders, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers in the apple marketing sector. The study found that apples are processed into value-added forms such as jam, wine, and juice, exhibited the most substantial degree of value addition, contributing 55.80 percent to the overall value addition, and that majority of Apple farmers acquire their inputs from private institutes, and there is a direct market chain farmers to consumers, which made the wholesalers experienced huge loss within the period under study.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable but there will be need to clearly reflect business or market in the topic. It will be in this form "Business Value Chain Analysis of Apple in Shimla District of Himachal Pradesh" The addition of business or market is needed because the study encapsulates both the production process, and the business chains involved.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive but needs some additions. Why this study? The author should include a short sentence on the main reason for carrying out this study. Change this "2021-22" to 2021-20222. The result should clearly reflect value chain processes and market or business value chain. Do not merge the two together. Contribution to knowledge is missing in the abstract</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure and subsections of the manuscript are appropriate. However, literature is missing. The literature aspect is the foundation of this study. Author needs to inform the readers the current trend and direction of literature in the subject matter and prove how this present study is more plausible than earlier studies.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The introduction is too short and lacks citations. I want to believe this is not the first and only study on this subject. I would like to see the author discussing about value chain, business value chain, linkage between the two, then narrow it down to Apple. All these will make the paper interesting to read and be scientific. The author committed an academic offence by not citing any author in the introduction. Why was the study limited to Shimla District of Himachal Pradesh? Why not other locations? The author needs to justify that in the introduction. Why did the author benchmark the study to the year 2021-2022 while we are in 2024? This is quite unclear. The author needs to justify it. Does it mean that the result will be unusable for future years? The author should do some rework on the grammar and use of English in the study. In the result section, it is noted that the author kept the socioeconomic characteristics of participants away from the reader. This is highly essential in this type of study. In the methodology and abstract sections, the author failed to identify secondary data, but secondary data was mentioned in the result.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>There are some references that were not cited. In fact, more than 80% of the references are not cited in the body of the work. This is not acceptable in research. The references are not sufficient The arrangement of the references is not scientific</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article should be reworked for this type of scholarly communications	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Oluwafemi Royal Aliu
Department, University & Country	School of Agriculture, Policy and Development, University of Reading, United Kingdom