Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_123841**
Title of the Manuscript:	**AMUL PREFERRED OUTLETS (APOS) SATISFACTION TOWARDS SERVICES OFFERED BY VASUDHARA DAIRY – STAFF SOCIETY**
Type of the Article	

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)*
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 manuscript holds significance for the scientific community as it offers insights into the operational challenges and satisfaction levels of Amul Preferred Outlet (APO) owners, an important part of the dairy supply chain in India. By analyzing customer satisfaction and operational efficiency, it provides valuable data for improving service delivery in the dairy industry, which plays a crucial role in India's economy. I appreciate the manuscript's comprehensive analysis and practical implications for enhancing the supply chain and product offerings, but it could benefit from deeper exploration of the broader economic impact and more innovative solutions to the identified challenges.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is fairly descriptive but could be more concise and focused to better capture the essence of the study. A suggested alternative could be: "Evaluating Amul Preferred Outlets' (APOs) Satisfaction with Services from Vasudhara Dairy - Staff Society"	
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 effectively introduces the scope of the study, focusing on the Indian dairy industry and the role of Amul Parlours. However, it would benefit from clearer explanations of methodology and the broader significance of findings. Consider adding more specific details on methodology and refining the discussion of the findings. Removing mentions of irrelevant players (like Mother Dairy) might also make it more focused. Although the findings are mentioned, some points, such as "handling orders that are ignored," are vague. It would be useful to clarify the nature of these ignored orders. Additionally, breaking down the key challenges (e.g., broken products, emergency deliveries) more distinctly would make it clearer. While the abstract mentions examining the satisfaction of APO owners, a clearer objective statement is needed. For instance, explicitly state whether the goal is to improve operational efficiency, service satisfaction, or something else.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**In introduction section,** • The introduction provides a thorough overview of India's dairy industry, particularly Amul's role. However, it is somewhat lengthy and could benefit from a more focused structure. Consider condensing some of the historical data on milk production to maintain the reader's attention on the core topic: supply chain challenges faced by Amul's preferred outlets. • The problem statement is briefly mentioned towards the end but can be introduced earlier. Shifting the focus to the issues of supply chain challenges and Amul parlour operations earlier in the introduction would provide a stronger connection to the study's objectives. • Shorten the statistical data on milk production and focus on more relevant figures that tie into the study's objectives. • Introduce the study's focus on supply chain issues earlier in the introduction. • Consider removing some of the detailed information about GCMMF's global operations and awards if they don't directly support the main study. • Streamline the introduction to focus on the supply chain challenges faced by Amul parlours, removing extraneous details that are not directly relevant to the research. **In materials and methods section,** Add a brief rationale for the choice of sampling method and sample size for better transparency. Clarify the term "schedule" and briefly justify the selected analytical tools. he tools for analysis (tabular analysis, graphical method, and WAM) are clearly stated. If possible, briefly mention why these tools were selected or how they are relevant to the study. The use of descriptive research and purposive sampling is appropriate, but you might want to explain the rationale behind selecting this specific sampling method, especially since it's non-probability sampling.	

Review Form 3

	In Results and discussion, The data is presented clearly with detailed frequency and percentage breakdowns, making it easy to interpret the various aspects of customer satisfaction and preferences. However, the text accompanying the tables can be made more concise to avoid repetition, especially when explaining percentages. The tabular data is well-organized, but some of the tables appear redundant. For example, Table 2 and Table 4 both discuss delivery frequency. Consider merging these tables or clarifying the difference in the variables if they are meant to convey separate points. The explanation of the tables is descriptive but lacks deeper analysis. For instance, discussing potential causes behind the issues like damaged products or low satisfaction in specific areas could add value. Highlighting key takeaways or trends across multiple tables can also improve the overall analysis. Streamline the explanation of the data and focus on key takeaways. Merge similar tables where possible and include more in-depth analysis for a stronger impact. **In conclusions,** The conclusion would be stronger if it included concrete suggestions for how Vasudhara Dairy – Staff Society can address the identified challenges. For example, suggesting improvements in logistics or introducing a feedback system for order fulfillment issues would make the conclusion more actionable. Strengthen the conclusion by including specific recommendations and expanding on the implications of the findings for improving service and satisfaction.	
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.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its systematic approach to data collection and analysis. The use of primary data gathered from a well-defined sample of Amul Preferred Outlets (APOs) ensures the relevance and reliability of the findings. The application of descriptive research methods, along with clear presentation of statistical data and trends, supports the validity of the conclusions drawn. Furthermore, the manuscript effectively integrates empirical data with practical implications, providing a solid foundation for understanding and addressing operational challenges within the dairy industry.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	• Recent articles or reports on supply chain management in the dairy industry. • Studies focusing on customer satisfaction in retail and food service sectors. • Updated data or case studies related to Amul or similar dairy cooperatives. Including recent and comprehensive references will strengthen the manuscript and provide a broader context for the research findings.	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Simplifying sentences and avoiding jargon where possible can improve understanding. Maintain consistent terminology and style throughout the manuscript. This includes the use of technical terms and formatting. Double-check for grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, or typographical mistakes that could detract from the professionalism of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript could benefit from a more detailed discussion of the broader economic implications of the findings. Additionally, including comparisons with similar studies or industry benchmarks could enhance the context and relevance of the results.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**A S Ramya**
Department, University & Country	**Kongu Engineering College, India**