

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_128798
Title of the Manuscript:	Marketing Efficiency of Apple in Shimla District of Himachal Pradesh
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides a detailed analysis of the marketing efficiency of apples in Shimla, a key apple-producing region in India. It addresses critical issues such as marketing channels, cost, and efficiency, which are vital for improving the livelihoods of small and marginal farmers. By identifying efficient disposal patterns and suggesting collective marketing strategies, the study offers actionable insights that can help enhance the sustainability and profitability of apple farming. Furthermore, it contributes to the broader discourse on agricultural marketing and rural development, especially in hilly regions with unique geographical and infrastructural challenges.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	It is comprehensive, but if the author could add Specific Findings, Practical Implications, and Future Scope of Study , the abstract could be more thorough and provide a concise article summary.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct as it sets clear objectives and aligns them with a robust methodology, including multistage random sampling. Identifying marketing channels, costs, and margins is grounded in real-world data from farmers and intermediaries, ensuring relevance and reliability. Additionally, it references credible sources and integrates findings from previous studies, establishing a strong theoretical foundation. The study's emphasis on marketing efficiency and its practical implications for farmers demonstrates a solid understanding of horticultural marketing systems.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication but requires minor improvements for clarity and conciseness.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is relevant and well-structured.	

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:	Vikas Kumar
Department, University & Country	Himachal Pradesh University, India