

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_123025
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficiency And Performance Of Different Fish Marketing Channels In Raichur District Of Karnataka
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>It's very important to the scientific community because it gives a thorough look at the different ways that fish are sold in Raichur District. This helps us understand how hard it is for fish farmers to make the most money.</p> <p>According to the study, the results show that how well farmers sell their fish is very important to their bottom line. This means that the fish marketing system needs to be streamlined. I like this book because it is useful in real life and could help policymakers make decisions that will make fish farming in India more profitable and long-lasting. The study is a good starting point for more research that will try to improve farm marketing systems, which are very important for food security and economic growth in rural areas.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Assessing the Effectiveness of Fish Marketing Channels and Their Effect on Producer Profits in the Raichur District of India</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 does a great job of summarising the study's main points and discussing their relevance to the various channels used to sell fish in Raichur District. Maybe writer could be more clarification on channel efficiency. The abstract states that channel III is less efficient than channels I and II, but it fails to specify why. It would be more convincing if you briefly explained why it is thought to be less efficient. And maybe write may amend the abstract alludes to the constraints placed on marketing efficiency by more concrete considerations, but this aspect could use some more emphasis. To make the analysis more thorough, write may talk about why farmers pick for less efficient channels even though they cost more.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>It is suggested write do some amendment including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract is short and easy to understand. Make sure it includes the goals, the method, the main results, and the conclusions. 2. Maybe write shold consider adding literature review The present literature review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the historical development and contemporary state of fish farming in India. An analysis of prior research on marketing channels in the agricultural and fish farming sectors. 3. Writer may provide the formulas used for calculating gross returns, net returns, and returns per rupee of investment. Mention how the frequency and percentage of farmers using each channel were calculated. 	
<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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript is technically sound and scientifically robust as a result of its systematic approach to examining the efficacy and performance of various fish marketing channels in Raichur District, Karnataka. 2. The study is firmly rooted in empirical research, employing an Ex-post-facto research design and a representative sample of 120 fish producers. 3. The results are the result of a comprehensive analysis of the marketing channels, which includes factors such as net returns, market intermediaries, and marketing structure. 4. The methodology is transparent. 5. Furthermore, the study's conclusions are logically derived from the data, providing valuable insights into the challenges and opportunities in the fish marketing system. 6. These insights are substantiated by pertinent literature and statistical evidence. 7. The credibility and reliability of the findings are significantly improved by this comprehensive analysis. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some of these sources are pretty new. To make sure the research is up-to-date with the latest trends and results in the field, it would be helpful to include more recent sources, especially from the last 3–5 years. 	

Review Form 3

:	2. Your manuscript will be stronger and more in line with current research trends and policy discussions if you use more recent and varied sources.	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language used in your piece is mostly appropriate for academic writing, but there are some places where it could be clearer, shorter, and flow better overall.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use fewer words and sentences, like "it is important to know" or "in order to." 2. When you can, use active voice to make your words clearer and more interesting. 3. Simplify hard-to-read phrases to make them easier to read. 4. Ensure consistency in terminology (e.g., use "fish farming" throughout rather than alternating with "fisheries" unless referring to something specific). 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Since this work could advance the discipline, it is advised that it be published in the Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eleanor Daniella Binti Lokman
Department, University & Country	Malaysia