

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_121283
Title of the Manuscript:	Supply chain of Amul fresh milk products: A study of Amul dairy's retailers in Anand city and Vidyanagar
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.	The importance of the manuscript for the scientific community is negligible. As mentioned in the abstract "The study revealed that the data obtained was statistically insignificant, suggesting that the analysis may not be generalizable to the broader population.". The results are not indicating any major findings. The research objective is not clear.	
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.	The abstract is fine.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Literature review is missing. Research objectives/ hypotheses are missing	
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 manuscript is depicting very basic data summary techniques. I cannot observe any scientific relevance of the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Very few references are used.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Deepshikha Aggarwal
Department, University & Country	Jagan Institute of Management Studies, India