

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125183
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Review on Ginger Value Addition: Prospects For Improving Farmer Producer Organization (FPO) Members' Income</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is valuable for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive analysis of the role of value addition in the ginger industry, especially via farmer producer organizations. The manuscripts focus on enhancing smallholder farmers incomes through the use of cutting-edge processing techniques, market opportunities, and innovative packaging is essential for addressing the key challenges faced by these farmers. The detailed exploration of both technical and economic factors, supported by research and case studies. <b>Further, empirical evidence regarding the efficacy of suggested strategies, however, may enhance their practical applications.</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The current title is clear but it might be more focused and interesting to better represent the paper's key points of focus. An alternative suggestion that highlights the practical implications and technological features of value addition is as follows:  <b>“Enhancing Income for Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) through Ginger Value Addition: Opportunities, Strategies, and Market Insights”</b>                      This alternative title emphasizes the focus on improving FPO members' income while signalling the paper's detailed exploration of value addition techniques and market strategies.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is well-written but can be improved by <b>highlighting important value adding techniques such as post-harvest processing and product diversification, along with market opportunities.</b> Additionally, addressing challenges faced by FPOs, <b>such as financial constraints and market accessibility, will enhance its comprehensiveness.</b> The abstract could be further improved by making it clear whether the review covers technical and economic issues as well as eliminating repetitive sentences.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript's structure is sound and appropriate for the topic. However, <b>minor refinements in clarity, navigation, and conciseness in certain sections</b> would improve readability and impact. I suggest emphasizing actionable recommendations more clearly, <b>particularly regarding how FPOs can effectively address the challenges outlined</b></p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, offering a comprehensive analysis of ginger value addition to enhance FPO farmers income. It is well-supported by relevant literature and provides detailed insights into processing techniques, market opportunities, and farmer challenges. The use of credible sources and technical data strengthens the accuracy and practical relevance of the recommendations.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :-</p>	<p>The references cited are mostly recent and relevant, focusing on ginger value addition, processing techniques, and FPOs. However, adding more recent studies on value addition technologies, market opportunities, and FPO impacts would enhance the manuscript's rigor. I recommend including sources related to innovations in ginger processing technologies, insights into global market dynamics and pricing trends, and the evolving role of FPOs in modern agricultural value chains with case studies. Incorporating these sources will strengthen the discussion and reflect current trends and innovations.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The article is well-prepared for scholarly communication, with appropriate language and depth of information. With some <b>minor revisions for conciseness and clarity</b> , it would be even more effective in conveying its findings and arguments to an academic audience.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	A brief summary of key findings in the conclusion would strengthen the manuscript's contributions. While the literature review is comprehensive, it could benefit from insights into recent trends in consumer preferences for organic and sustainably sourced products. Clarifying the selection criteria for included studies and discussing the methodologies used would enhance credibility. Improving data presentation with additional visual aids, especially in sections on drying methods and market opportunities, is recommended. A more detailed analysis of specific policies that effectively support FPOs would also provide valuable insights for stakeholders. Optional suggestions include exploring emerging markets for ginger products, emphasizing consumer awareness strategies, dedicating a section to sustainability, incorporating case studies of successful FPOs, and proposing future research directions on the impact of value addition on farmers' livelihoods and consumer behaviour.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Luwangshangbam James Singh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya (BCKV), India</b>