

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126749
Title of the Manuscript:	Existing status and agribusiness potential of Acacia catechu based entrepreneurship in Una and Kangra districts of Himachal Pradesh.
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>

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<div>1. The study on Acacia catechu-based entrepreneurship is timely and relevant, addressing an important area of agribusiness with socioeconomic impacts on rural communities.</div> <div>2. The introduction provides a thorough understanding of Acacia catechu's significance, its uses, and medicinal properties, which strengthens the rationale for the study.</div> <div>3. The objectives of assessing entrepreneurship potential and suggesting policy implications are well-defined and align with the study's scope.</div> <div>4. The research methodology, including data collection methods and sample size, is clearly explained, giving readers insight into how the study was conducted.</div> <div>5. A sample size of only 25 entrepreneurs may limit the generalizability of findings. A larger sample could provide more robust conclusions.</div> <div>6. Convenience sampling, while useful, may introduce bias. Random or stratified sampling could strengthen the reliability of the study results.</div> <div>7. The analysis primarily uses basic mathematical tools. More advanced statistical methods could deepen the insights and improve data validity.</div> <div>8. Minor errors in spelling and grammar were noted, which could benefit from further proofreading for clarity and professionalism.</div>	Noted

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)	