

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_122201</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Unraveling the Constraints Associated with Groundnut Marketing: A Comprehensive Review</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	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.	Below are the points regarding the important points covered in manuscript: Groundnut marketing plays a critical role in the agricultural economy, especially in regions where groundnuts are a major crop. The comprehensive review of the constraints associated with groundnut marketing is essential because it sheds light on the challenges that farmers, traders, and other stakeholders face, from production to final sale. Understanding these constraints—such as inadequate infrastructure, fluctuating market prices, limited access to credit, and inefficiencies in supply chains—can lead to more informed policy decisions, targeted interventions, and innovations that enhance the market's efficiency.	
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.	Yes, Abstract seems to be comprehensive and up to the mark. Author has covered all the points related to the article.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, all the parts and structure of the article seems to be appropriate and allined.	
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.	These are the points on which manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound: 1. To assess the scientific correctness of a manuscript, it's essential to evaluate the accuracy of the data presented, the rigor of the methodology, the logic of the interpretations, and the relevance of the conclusions to the evidence provided. 2. This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound would demonstrate a clear and well-defined research question, employ appropriate and validated methods, and include a thorough analysis that aligns with the data collected. 3. The results of manuscript is reproducible, and the discussion should critically engage with existing literature, highlighting both the study's contributions and its limitations. It seems that all these elements are present and well-executed in the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality is good and easy to understand.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Good Work	

#### 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:	Abdal Ahmed
Department, University & Country	Tula's Institute, India