

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_130636
Title of the Manuscript:	Natural Rubber Marketing in Karnataka: A Study on Costs, Marketing Channels, and Price Spread
Type of the Article	Empirical

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article is crucial for the scientific community as it offers useful insights into the domestic marketing arrangement of natural rubber in Karnataka, a key rubber-producing state in India. Recognising the primary cost elements, such as transportation, highlights essential facets of efficiency and obstacles within the supply chain. The results, especially regarding producers' share of customers' expenditures across different channels, enhance comprehension of how farmers might optimise their income. This study presents a methodology for enhancing the rubber selling system and provides a basis for future research on optimising agricultural value chains in analogous locations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 of the article is clear and provides a concise overview of the study. However, there is room for improvement to enhance its comprehensiveness and clarity. Here are my suggestions: 1. Explicitly state the primary objective of the study at the beginning. 2. Briefly mention why Dakshina Kannada and Udupi districts were chosen for the study. 3. Include a brief mention of why Rubber Producers' Societies (RPS) of Type-2 are the most preferred channel by farmers. 4. Highlight the implications of transportation costs and how they affect farmers' earnings. 5. Add a statement about the broader significance of the study, such as its implications for improving rubber marketing efficiency or policy recommendations.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the calculation is correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	1. The introductory section isn't thorough. It should establish the context of the work. 2. The keywords that are present may be reorganised. 3. The paper lacks a well-structured methodology section, such as the absence of a sampling frame.	

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:	Pradip Chouhan
Department, University & Country	National Law University, India