

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_121674
Title of the Manuscript:	VALUE ADDITION AND CONSUMER PREFERENCE ON SOCIAL MEDIA MARKETING: A CASE STUDY OF THE KAZHANI FARMERS MARKET
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Totally, the subject of the manuscript is interesting and valuable in the marketing field, which can bring insight into the importance of consumers' attitudes towards producing agricultural products. However, the cause-and-effect relations are not supported scientifically.</p> <p>"Exploring how value-added features, such as improved health benefits, enhanced product quality, and innovative characteristics, influence consumer choices", is mentioned as the study objective, while there is no statistical or rational analysis to analyze "the role of value addition in shaping consumer preferences through social media marketing".</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>It's OK</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>"cater to health-conscious consumers" is mentioned in the final sentence of the abstract, but there is no evidence to identify this kind of consciousness in consumers. The word should be chosen with more precision.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Method section, there is nothing about how they collected data, how they analyzed, nothing about the "open-ended questions", nothing about the participants. • There is no Discussion section in the manuscript. "RESULTS AND DISCUSSION" is mentioned in the manuscript, but the content is related to the results. Discussion should provide an overview of the results, a comparison with other articles, suggestions, limitations, etc. 	
<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>I think this is not scientifically robust and technically sound. Its objectives were not supported properly by its analyzing method. Just a descriptive method was used to analyze the frequency and percentage. However, correlation or regression analysis is needed to explore the role of value addition in shaping consumer preferences through social media marketing.</p>	
<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>Just two references were in 2022, and others belong below 2019 and below. several websites are mentioned in the references, but they aren't referred to properly and according to the standard formats.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It's OK.	
Optional/General comments	The subject of the manuscript is interesting, but it needs more revision in - Rewriting the Method and mentioning details about the question, gathering data, analyzing data, and participants. - Separating the Result and Discussion sections - Writing the Discussion section based on the standard format of the scientific articles. - Editing the abstract and conclusion by more precise and based on the manuscript's objectives.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Farzaneh Yousefi
Department, University & Country	Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Iran