

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_122165
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on marketing of Marigold Flower in Varanasi district of Uttar Pradesh
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>
<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>This manuscript is important to the scientific community as it focuses on specific aspects of marketing channels, efficiency, marketing margins, and spreads—areas that require more in-depth research, especially with changing consumer behavior and technological advancements. It offers valuable insights that can enhance both theoretical understanding and practical applications. However, the manuscript currently lacks depth and is written in a casual tone. With more rigorous work, it has the potential to make a significant impact.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>No, since marketing encompasses a wide range of topics, while the paper's findings focus solely on marketing-related channels, efficiency etc., the title of the paper also needs to be changed accordingly.</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 should be written in a seamless, continuous form without any breaks. Writing it without paragraphing is acceptable, as it ensures a smooth flow of information. Proper structuring without interruptions is important for clarity in an abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Moderately appropriate</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>Marketing channels should be based on scientifically proven, recent findings. For example, in the case of flowers, their perishable nature requires careful consideration when designing channels. You may also refer to highly-rated scholarly journals for further guidance. The channels mentioned in the manuscript are outdated and conventional. A graphical or visual presentation should be included to enhance the clarity and readability of the tables, making the data easier to understand.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references provided are insufficient and do not adequately support the findings of your study with proper citations. Please ensure that the referencing style follows the journal's recommendations and adhere to the correct format.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Need to improve</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The analytical tools is missing in methodology section for evaluating marketing efficiency, price spread, and margins. Please include them if applicable. Authors contribution: Competing interest: Ethical issues: Funding: Should we have written at the end of results part- prior to references section.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Sachin Rathour
Department, University & Country	BHU, India