

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_122219</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF FARMER PRODUCER COMPANIES ON GOOD AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES: KNOWLEDGE, IMPLEMENTATION, AND BARRIERS</b>
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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	This is a good contribution in the field of agricultural science and technology. Besides its promotion for agricultural development, it addresses identified barriers to agricultural technology or innovation adoption. This is crucial for promoting sustainable farming practices and ensuring the broader adoption of GAPs across the countries.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Not really. Hence, an alternative title is suggested: Evaluation of Farmer Producer Companies' Knowledge, Implementation and Barriers on Good Agricultural Practices.	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is comprehensive but needs a slight adjustment in the conclusion section. As stated in manuscript's comment, conclusion should be based on scope of the study's objective. Hence, the additional information could be turned to Recommendation and written thus: The study thereby recommends the need to address the identified barriers to help promote sustainable farming practices and ensure broader adoption of GAPs across the region thereby contributing to agricultural development in Tamil Nadu.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes.	
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript focus on the field of agricultural science and technology makes it scientifically robust. Also, its promotion for agricultural development, and technology or innovation adoption qualifies it to be technically sound. These two vital points in a nutshell ascertain its scientific correctness and fit for this journal.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :	With 21 references cited and 71% out it being 10 years below makes it acceptable on the average. Meanwhile, there is a need for consistency in the in-text citations writing style as some of them need revisiting and editing.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	There is a need for a thorough rework in the data analysis section as presentented in the manuscript. With infractions in the N total under some sections, the data analysis are queried. The author will need to look into it and do the needful. This infractions alone are enough to turn this manuscript down but if the author could dedicate his/her time to correct the anomalies, the manuscript is good to be considered for publication.	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Adesegun Samson Adetola</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ahmadu Bello University, Nigeria</b>