

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122394
Title of the Manuscript:	An Economic Analysis of Small Ruminants Marketing in Southern Karnataka
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 crucial for the scientific community as it addresses the complexities of small ruminant marketing in an unorganized sector, providing valuable insights into local market dynamics and the implications of various marketing channels on farmers' profitability. By highlighting significant challenges such as high transportation costs and inadequate market infrastructure, along with actionable policy recommendations, the study has the potential to enhance the livelihoods of marginalized farmers and contribute to sustainable agricultural practices. While the research presents important findings, it could benefit from greater clarity in structure and the inclusion of specific case studies or empirical data to further strengthen its arguments.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is generally suitable as it clearly indicates the focus of the study, including the economic aspect and the specific geographical region. However, it could be made more descriptive or engaging to attract a broader audience, such as:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">"Understanding Market Dynamics and Profitability in Small Ruminant Marketing: An Economic Analysis in Southern Karnataka"</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 of the article provides a comprehensive overview of the small ruminants' market in India, effectively outlining the challenges faced by farmers, the importance of selecting appropriate marketing channels, and the associated costs. While this abstract is indeed informative, it may be further enhanced by considering the following suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction of Context: Begin with a brief sentence providing context about the importance of small ruminants in India. For example, mention their role in the economy or their significance to farmers' livelihoods. 2. Clarification of Purpose and Objectives: A clear statement delineating the primary aim and objectives of the study at the outset would greatly benefit the reader's understanding. For instance, stating, "This study aims to analyze the marketing dynamics of small ruminants in Southern Karnataka and to identify effective strategies for improving market efficiency," would provide valuable context. 3. Research Methodology: Although the summary identifies various marketing channels, it would be beneficial to include details regarding the methodology employed in data collection and analysis. A brief description of the research methods used would enhance the abstract's credibility and informativeness. 4. Formatting and Language: To improve clarity and conciseness, certain phrases could be streamlined. For example, the phrase "who facilitate the transactions along the marketing chain" could be revised to "who facilitate marketing transactions." Furthermore, I recommend replacing instances of "i.e." with "such as" to enhance readability. 5. Use of Verbs in the Correct Tenses: The summary predominantly employs the present tense (e.g., "Farmers predominantly rely on middlemen..."). While present tense is acceptable for ongoing practices, utilizing the past tense can enhance clarity when discussing research results and methodologies. For instance, "The study identified..." would be preferable to "The chosen channel must minimize...". It is important to maintain present and future tense appropriately when making recommendations, as in, "there is a need for..." 6. Currency Format: Additionally, I suggest using "United States Dollar" instead of "\$" to enhance clarity for an international audience. 7. Keywords: The presently selected keywords effectively summarize the key themes of the research. However, the addition of terms such as "cost analysis" or "market structure" could further strengthen the abstract for indexing and searchability purposes. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure is generally appropriate but could benefit from clearer subsections and more detailed narrative explanations. Consider organizing the content into distinct, titled subsections for each major topic (e.g., marketing channels, costs, price spreads, wool marketing, reasons for sale and purchase) and providing summary analyses that connect the data to practical implications. This approach will enhance readability and make the findings more actionable for stakeholders.</p>	

Review Form 3

<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>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its comprehensive analysis of sheep and goat marketing in Southern Karnataka. It employs a methodical approach to data collection by interviewing a diverse sample of market intermediaries and farmers, ensuring a representative overview of the market dynamics. The use of well-established analytical tools, such as price spread and producer share in consumer rupee, provides a rigorous evaluation of market efficiency and cost structures. Additionally, the inclusion of comparative analyses across different marketing channels and the detailed breakdown of costs and margins underscore the manuscript's thorough examination of the economic factors affecting sheep and goat rearing. This meticulous approach ensures that the findings are both reliable and actionable for improving market practices and policy-making.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>While many references are relevant, the most recent study cited is from 2017. Given the rapid changes in agricultural economics and market systems, it would be beneficial to include more recent studies to reflect current trends and challenges in sheep and goat marketing. The references cited in the reference list are not included in the body of the article. Integrating these references into the text would enhance the credibility of the claims made and provide readers with the necessary context for the findings.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Need to improve</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>*The discussion section could benefit from further development. As it currently stands, it lacks depth and does not adequately interpret the findings in relation to existing literature or practical implications. Expanding on how the results connect with previous studies, addressing potential limitations, and discussing the implications for policy and practice would strengthen this section significantly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have made specific comments directly on the manuscript itself for further clarification and context. 	

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:	Rula Awad
Department, University & Country	National Agronomic Institute of Tunisia (INAT), Carthage University, Tunisia