

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_123709
Title of the Manuscript:	Constraints faced by onion farmers in western undulating zone of Odisha for adopting the improved practices and suggestions to overcome
Type of the Article	Research 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.	The article deals with a detailed examination of the various constraints faced by the farmers producing onions. It provides actionable suggestions to overcome the challenges, such as training programs and improved access to resources. The application of the Garrett ranking technique enhances its credibility.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Constraints faced by the farmers in the production and marketing of onions in the western undulating zone of Odisha	
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.	Abstract seems to be comprehensive. Keywords can be rearranged.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the structure and sub sections are appropriate to the title and objective of the manuscript. The author can mention 'objectives of the study' as a separate subsection.	
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 paper seems technically sound. The selection of tools to analyse the objective is appropriate. Source of table should be mentioned below the table. The conclusion and recommendation part can be rearranged to make it simple. Conclusion should be the last part of the article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are adequate, but it lags APA format.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. It is recommended to follow report writing format somewhere.	
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:	P.Manimalathi
Department, University & Country	Sri Ramakrishna College of Arts and Science, India