

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 (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>This manuscript is essential for the scholarly community since it presents a thorough economic analysis of small ruminant marketing, with a particular emphasis on sheep and goat markets in Southern Karnataka. It illustrates the obstacles that small-scale farmers face such as high transportation costs and poor market facilities, which have a direct influence on their profitability. The study's findings on the effectiveness of various marketing channels and their related costs provide significant information for policymakers and stakeholders seeking to improve market systems and promote rural farmers' livelihoods.</p>	<p>1.</p>
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title reflects the main focus, scope, and findings of the article</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. Clarify the Study's Scope and Objectives 2. The abstract should briefly mention the key findings or conclusions of the study 3. Strengthen the conclusion 4. Ensure the keywords used are specific and relevant. While "Small ruminants," "marketing channels," "marketing efficiency," and "transportation costs" are appropriate, consider adding keywords like "economic analysis," "Karnataka," and "livestock market" to improve the article's discoverability. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</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>This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. Firstly, it employs a structured economic analysis, systematically evaluating different marketing channels for small ruminants in Southern Karnataka, which is crucial for deriving reliable conclusions. Secondly, the study is data-driven, utilizing actual cost components such as transportation and middlemen fees, which ensures that the findings are grounded in real-world conditions. Additionally, the research highlights the practical implications of the results, suggesting improvements like regulated markets and better transportation, which demonstrates a clear understanding of the subject and its broader economic impact</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>No</p> <p>The references cited in the manuscript appear to be comprehensive, covering both foundational studies and recent research in the field of agricultural marketing channels. However, it would be beneficial to ensure that the most recent studies, particularly from the last 5-10 years, are adequately represented. If the manuscript lacks citations from key recent research on small ruminant economics or the role of middlemen in agricultural markets, I would recommend including those to strengthen the manuscript's relevance and robustness.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-structured, with clear and concise language that effectively conveys the research findings. However, there are a few minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that could be improved for better readability. A careful proofreading or minor editing would enhance the overall quality and ensure that the text meets the highest standards of academic writing.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Wondemu Bogale Teseme
Department, University & Country	Oda Bultum University, Ethiopia