

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_125562
Title of the Manuscript:	Price spread, Marketing efficiency and postharvest losses in marketing of selected kharif vegetables in Palghar district of Maharashtra State
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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>
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.	This manuscript focuses on post-harvest losses (PHL), a critical issue for sustainable agricultural systems and a major challenge for achieving food security worldwide, especially in India where the Global Hunger Index shows severe levels of hunger in 2024. This paper also addresses price spread and market efficiency which are major concerns of agricultural marketing and consumer welfare. Focusing on these relevant issues, this manuscript is an interesting attempt to quantitatively measure PHL, price spread and market efficiency of Kharif vegetables in the Palghar district of Maharashtra.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grammatical and typing errors need to be fixed. In the eighth line of abstract 'In of case....' is written instead of 'In case of...'. Punctuation mark (,) and brackets are wrongly placed. 'was' is used instead of 'were' with losses. Appropriate tense should be used for sentences and 'will be' should be avoided in 'Materials and Methods' section. 2. Full names of channels should be mentioned instead of abbreviations to provide more clarity to the readers. 3. Methodology should be defined more strongly and clearly in the abstract to attract more readers. 4. For better understanding, instead of giving all the figures/data of PHL, price spread and efficiency for all vegetables and channels, a conclusive statement about the highest level of PHL and best and most efficient channel across the vegetables can be written. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The results and discussion section can be divided into two subsections- one for price spread and market efficiency and the other for PHL. 2. 'Tabular Analysis' section is not required separately. It can be merged with 'Analysis of Data'. 3. Sources of tables and figures are not mentioned. Even if the figures in the tables/charts are the author's calculations based on primary data collected, a note about it should be mentioned below the tables and figures as the source. 4. A review of previous studies is not mentioned anywhere in the manuscript. 	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More clarity is needed regarding the measurement of market efficiency and PHL. The manuscript lacks a mention of the method or formula for assessing market efficiency. Similarly, the computation of PHL at various levels should be defined separately, as the provided formula for PHL is not appropriate for measuring it at farmers' level. The role of commission agents must be explained to understand how PHL is generated at this level in Channel I. 2. Instead of referring to general statistical tools, specific tool/s should be identified in the 'Analysis of Data' section. It should be clearly explained how a single value of price or PHL for a stratum/level is derived from data collected from multiple respondents within the same stratum/level. 3. The technique mentioned in 'Tabular Analysis' section as "overall farmers assessment of commodity movement system" needs to be verified. It does not seem to be a standardized technique, and if it is, a reference should be provided. The technique found in other research papers is 'Commodity System Assessment Methodology (CSAM)' 4. The technique used for sample selection should be named, along with the rationale for choosing three tehsils and three vegetables. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The citations in the text are improper. Referring to other research studies in relation to the primary data in the tables is irrelevant. The relevance of these references is unclear or they may be incorrectly cited. Aside from the first two references, the other studies mentioned in the reference section are not relevant or miscited in the text. 2. The referencing style does not adhere to the submission guidelines for authors. 	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The grammatical and typing mistakes must be corrected before publication.	
Optional/General comments	1. This manuscript addresses significant issues in agricultural economics and is really engaging. To enhance its quality, it should include a discussion on the reasons behind post-harvest losses (PHL) and market efficiency, rather than just presenting data. Additionally, based on the primary survey results, the author is requested to provide suggestions for addressing PHL and market inefficiencies.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Neha Paliwal
Department, University & Country	Mohanlal Sukhadia University, India