Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_126066**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Value chain analysis of cattle feed market in Banaskantha district**
Type of the Article	**Original 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** *(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 makes significant contributions by addressing the critical gap in understanding cattle feed market dynamics at the district level, particularly through its comprehensive analysis of buying behavior factors and future feed demand projections in Banaskantha district, which offers a replicable methodological framework for similar studies. **SEE ATTACHMENT**	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title "Value chain analysis of cattle feed market in Banaskantha district" is clear and specific	
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 current abstract adequately presents the methodology and key findings but lacks essential elements such as clear research objectives, background context about the importance of cattle feed markets, and practical implications of the study. To improve comprehensiveness, the abstract should include a brief opening context about feed market challenges, explicitly state research objectives upfront, and add practical implications of the findings for stakeholders like feed manufacturers, policy makers, and livestock farmers. Key additions should include specific insights from the value chain analysis (currently missing despite being in the title), practical recommendations based on results, and a clearer explanation of how the future feed demand projections were calculated, while some existing methodological details could be condensed.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript follows a basic logical structure (Abstract, Introduction, Methodology, Results and Discussion, Conclusion, References) but would benefit from additional sections including a separate Literature Review, Study Area Description, distinct Results and Discussion sections, Policy Implications, and Future Research Directions, along with a dedicated subsection for the value chain analysis mentioned in the title.	
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 rigor through its sound statistical methodology (including appropriate regression analysis and sampling techniques), robust results ($R^2 = 0.74$, F-value = 44.193, $p < 0.01$), and well-documented data sources, though it could be strengthened by including confidence intervals and addressing potential sampling limitations.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	Yes, the references are recent but not really sufficient, I recommend adding at least 15-20 more references to strengthen the literature base, particularly: • More international peer-reviewed articles • Recent methodological papers • Comparative studies from other regions • Theoretical frameworks for value chain analysis • Contemporary feed market research	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The manuscript's language quality needs moderate revision to address issues including grammar and syntax errors (especially tense consistency and article usage)	
Optional/General comments	None	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Minentle Lwando Mnukwa**
Department, University & Country	**University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa**