

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122442
Title of the Manuscript:	Agri-inputs sourcing networks of rice farmers in Andhra Pradesh and Kerala
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>
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.	This write-up is important to the agriculture field. Information on transportation, availability of credit facilities, and inputs are crucial to farmers and stakeholders. This helps farmers to make timely preparations, estimations, and budgets. All forms of farmers need this kind of network information especially rice farmers since rice is a staple food in the study area.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The topic is very suitable for the write-up.	
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.	The abstract is clear and concise however, it captured only the methodology and the major findings. The main aim of the study was not included in the abstract. Including the main aim will help readers outside the field understand clearly what the entire is about.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsection and structure are appropriate however the subsection captured as sampling and methodology should be captured as Materials and Methods since it contains subsections more than just sampling and methodology as required by the journal.	
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.	This manuscript is a great piece work as it informs farmers and stakeholders as to where to get the appropriate inputs to improve their agricultural practices.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not sufficient according to the guidelines of the journal.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the language is suitable for scholarly communication	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Dorcas Twumwaa Gyan
Department, University & Country	Southern University, A&M College, USA