

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	

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 by providing detailed insights into the supply chain of Milk products from a brand from the retailer's perspective. However, the journal is focused on specific community and geographical area, it shows the journal is important for the community around Anand City and Vidyanagar. While the geographic scope is limited, the study can serve as a pilot for broader research. The manuscript highlights the strengths of Amul's marketing strategies and brand presence, which are crucial for maintaining customer satisfaction and business continuity.</p> <p>What I liked:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study concludes with practical recommendations for improving the supply chain, which can be directly applied by industry practitioners to address identified issues. <p>What I didn't like:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sample size of 40 retailers may be considered small and the findings might not be generalized to a broader population. 2. The author should add more supporting journal articles. The journal relies on only six references, most of which are websites. This undermines the academic rigor and depth of the literature review, making it less robust. 3. The study only includes male respondents, which could overlook potential differences in perspectives from female retailers, leading to a biased understanding of the supply chain. 4. Focusing solely on Anand city and Vidyanagar limits the geographic scope of the study, potentially neglecting insights from other regions where Amul operates. The author can capture a wider range of perspectives and operational challenges by expanding the geographic scope. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is longer than it should be. I would suggest making it shorter. For example: "Retailer Insights on Amul's Fresh Milk Supply Chain" or "Amul Milk Supply Chain Study: Anand City and Vidyanagar Retailers". Both titles effectively convey the focus of the study. They are concise and clearly communicate the study's purpose. Having a long title has a negative impact on the citation rate of the journal paper. Reading a longer journal title makes readers miss important information. Also, it is difficult to remember, where it is imperative for researchers to have a title which is memorable and should be able to grasp the essence of the journal paper at the same time.</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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since the author is limiting his scope to two cities, he should mention the geographical limitation in the abstract. For instance, "However, the results may not be generalizable to a broader population due to the limited sample size and geographic scope." 2. Remove repetitive conclusion details: "The study concludes with actionable recommendations for Amul's fresh milk products supply chain. The study revealed that the data obtained was statistically insignificant, suggesting that the analysis may not be generalizable to the broader population." 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: This section is well-placed and provides a summary of the study. 2. Introduction: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. This section should provide background information, the significance of the study, and the research questions or hypotheses. b. Consider splitting the background information and the purpose of the study into separate paragraphs for clarity. 3. Methodology: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clearly outline the research design, sample size, data collection methods, and analysis techniques. b. Consider adding subsections such as "Research Design," "Sample," "Data Collection," and "Data Analysis" for better organization. 4. Results & Discussion: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. It's beneficial to keep these sections combined for this type of study but ensure that the results are clearly distinguished from the discussion. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>b. Use subsections for different aspects of the results, such as "Demographics," "Operational Insights," and "Satisfaction Levels."</p> <p>5. Conclusion:</p> <p>a. Summarize the main findings, implications, and any limitations of the study.</p> <p>b. Consider including a separate "Limitations" subsection within the Conclusion.</p> <p>6. Suggestion:</p> <p>a. This section should be included within the Conclusion, under a subsection titled "Recommendations" or "Practical Implications."</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>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its comprehensive study design, use of semi-structured questionnaires, and application of statistical tools like frequencies, percentages, and Likert scales. The data collection period and sample size are clearly stated, ensuring transparency and replicability. The analysis highlights key findings and operational challenges, providing actionable recommendations based on the data collected.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement/Correctness:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The percentage calculations are incorrect along with the discussion following it at section 3b. For instance, Outlets % are wrong. Order Booking Methods % are wrong. 2. Percent rounded up in the discussion at 3b but not in the table. Please keep them consistent. 3. Provide more detailed explanations for the communication strategies in table 3c, including justifications for the Likert scores and suggestions for improvement. 4. Include questions in the survey about how to improve satisfaction scores, particularly for communication strategies, to gather actionable insights directly from retailers. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>The manuscript contains only six references, most of which are websites. This is insufficient for a robust academic study. The references should include more peer-reviewed articles and scholarly sources to strengthen the theoretical foundation and support the study's findings. Include recent studies from journals on supply chain management, dairy industry practices, and retailer perspectives. Examples include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Supply Chain Management: An International Journal" 2. "Journal of Business Logistics" 3. "International Journal of Production Economics" 	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally clear but requires improvements to meet the standards of scholarly communication. Here are some specific suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure sentences are grammatically correct and clear. Some sentences are awkwardly structured and could be simplified for better readability. 2. Maintain a formal and objective tone throughout the manuscript. Avoid conversational language and ensure the use of precise academic terminology. 3. Ensure consistency in terminology and formatting, particularly in the use of statistical terms and references. 4. Some sections are wordy and can be made more concise without losing meaning. Focus on being clear and direct. <p>Examples:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Original: "The study revealed that the data obtained was statistically insignificant, suggesting that the analysis may not be generalizable to the broader population." Improved: "The study's data were statistically insignificant, indicating that the findings may not be generalizable to a broader population." 2. Original: "These positive findings underscore the strengths of Amul's supply chain, indicating successful collaboration and customer satisfaction across stakeholder groups." Improved: "These findings highlight the strengths of Amul's supply chain, demonstrating successful collaboration and high levels of customer satisfaction among stakeholders." 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The authors knowledge on the subject is good but publishing an article in journal requires level of detail.</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:	Rohit Vikas Akole
Department, University & Country	United States of America