

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 addresses a significant issue in India's dairy industry, focusing on the satisfaction of Amul Preferred Outlets (APOs) towards services provided by Vasudhara Dairy. Considering the large-scale impact of the dairy industry on the Indian economy, the manuscript's findings could help improve supply chain management and customer service for APOs. The exploration of challenges like damaged products, emergency delivery, and unmet demands for certain products provides actionable insights for enhancing operations. This is good.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Amul Preferred Outlets (APOs) Satisfaction Towards Services Offered by Vasudhara Dairy – Staff Society," is suitable but could be more concise if for example, removing "– Staff Society" would make it more focused. Also changing the "S in APO ^S " to lower case or small letter S.	
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 could be more comprehensive by including specific numerical results such the percentages and other numerical data presented in the results section. Adding insights into how the findings can be practically applied would improve its depth.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript follows a logical structure with sections such as Introduction, Methods, Results, and Conclusion. These sections are appropriate for a scientific study. The tables are well-organized and clearly present the data. It is suggested that the author includes graphs in addition to tables for better understanding.	
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 is scientifically robust because it suits the qualitative type of research. However, it could benefit from a deeper analysis of the factors influencing satisfaction. The use of descriptive statistics is clear, but a more sophisticated statistical analysis (e.g., regression analysis) could strengthen the conclusions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. The references are sufficient and recent hence no need for changes.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear, but there are several grammatical errors and inconsistencies. For example, some sentences lack appropriate punctuation like in the title where the "APOS" should have read "APOs", and certain sections could be rephrased for better clarity. In the Materials and Methods section, the author should have been specific on the number or sampling size by saying 98 respondents or participants and not just say 98.	
Optional/General comments	The study is well-organized, with relevant data and insights into the challenges faced by APOs. Its focus on practical implications is a major strength. A stronger analytical framework, better integration of results with the discussion, and a more polished language would significantly enhance the manuscript's quality.	

Review Form 3

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Patrick Lunda
Department, University & Country	Copperbelt University, Zambia