

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_124811
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmers' perception on the functioning of FPC-NRMFPCL in the Zaheerabad region of Sanga Reddy district, Telangana.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	I appreciate the manuscript for its timely and relevant contribution to understanding the role of FPCs in supporting smallholder farmers. This research addresses a critical aspect of agricultural sustainability in India, particularly for small and marginal farmers, who constitute a significant majority of the agricultural workforce. The importance of this manuscript lies in its potential to inform policymakers and agricultural organizations about the strengths and weaknesses of FPCs.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, its Suitable	
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.	The abstract is too long and contains excessive detail. It should be concise, presenting only the essential points: the problem, methodology, key results, and conclusion. Consider cutting down the less important details to make the abstract shorter and easier to read. The abstract includes a lot of specific mean scores and detailed results. Summarize the findings more concisely. Instead of listing all services and their mean scores, provide an overarching statement about the satisfaction levels of farmers, and mention only one or two standout services. While the abstract mentions the results, it lacks a clear concluding statement about the implications or importance of these findings. Add a sentence summarizing what the findings mean for the future of FPOs or agricultural development.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured, and the subsections are appropriate for the content presented. In the Material and Methods section on page 4, kindly specify the appropriate tools used for data collection. For the systematic random sampling method, clarify that you will be choosing every nth individual after a random starting point. (For example, you might mention selecting every 3 rd , 5 th , or 9 th individual).	
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.	The study is scientifically robust due to its clear rationale, which addresses the significant role of small and marginal farmers in the agricultural economy and their challenges in accessing essential resources. The results are presented in a comprehensive manner, with tables summarizing the data, and they effectively highlight areas of both satisfaction and improvement needed in various service domains, including input, technical, financial, and marketing services.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Additional References - It would be beneficial to incorporate studies from recent years (preferably from 2020 onwards) that examine the effectiveness of FPOs, especially during and after the COVID-19 pandemic, which has significantly impacted agricultural practices and market access.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The overall language and structure of the article are generally clear and understandable, making it suitable for scholarly communication. However, some sections could benefit from improved clarity and coherence. <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Ensure consistency in terminology and formatting throughout the article. For instance, the acronyms FPO and FPC are used interchangeably, which may confuse readers. It would be beneficial to clarify the distinctions and maintain consistent usage.2. Clarity: Certain phrases could be simplified for better comprehension. For example, instead of saying "involved intermediaries," you could state "the presence of intermediaries."3. A thorough proofreading is recommended to identify and correct any grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, or overly complex sentences.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I recommend it for publication with minor revisions to address the suggested improvements.	

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:	Balamurugan V
Department, University & Country	Agricultural College and Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India