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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The article explores the economic viability and constraints of the fresh fruit and vegetable supply chain in Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh. It contributes valuable insights into stakeholder profitability using cost-benefit ratio analysis and Garrett ranking, which is particularly relevant for policy formulation and supply chain improvements in developing regions. The study provides practical implications for improving farmer welfare, reducing middlemen involvement, and enhancing market linkages, making it useful for academicians, policymakers, and practitioners in agribusiness and rural development. | This research focus on the Cost -benefit analysis of supply chain stakeholders in fresh fruits and vegetables. It also compares the role of modern and traditional technology used for the supply chain and which one is beneficial. Constraints analysis help in identification of major problems faced by the stakeholders and helps in framing policies to tackle the issues. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, the title is appropriate. | Yes, it incorporates the gist of the research analysis |
| 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 provides an overview of the objectives, methodology, and major findings, but contains several grammatical errors and spelling errors.  **Suggested improvements:**   * Correct "gad higher CBR ratio" to "had a higher CBR". * Replace "the situation od farmers" with "the situation of farmers". * "Respondent incorporating" should be "Respondents incorporating". | All the suggested improvements have been revised in the manuscript. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript is scientifically sound in terms of objectives, analytical tools (CBR and Garrett Ranking), and presentation of results. However, the methodology section lacks clarity in formulas and could benefit from:   * The formulas for CBR and Garrett Ranking seems to be incomplete. * The sampling method is not clearly detailed for both modern and traditional supply chains. * There is no theoretical or conceptual framework guiding the analysis. | Lack of clarity in the methodology has been modified. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | * The references are mostly relevant and some are recent (2025), but formatting is inconsistent. * Citation style lacks consistency. Some entries show initials first; others show surnames first. * DOIs or links should be added where applicable. * Some references (like Singh, 2008) are outdated and can be replaced or supplemented with recent studies. | Inconsistency of citation has been modified  1. Some of the references which are holds vital information on why the study was necessary but I also added other recent references |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The manuscript requires moderate language revision. Some issues such as frequent grammatical errors, sentence construction issues (e.g., “the it should be shut downed” should be “it should be discontinued”), inconsistent headings and terms (e.g., "Cost Befit Ratio" instead of "Cost Benefit Ratio"), inconsistent of currency symbols and punctuation and inconsistent table formatting and alignment have to be corrected  Some sections which need correction include:  **Methodology:**   * "Multi stage purposive cum random sampling technique..." should be "A multi-stage purposive-cum-random sampling technique..." * "respondent of Lucknow district of Uttar Pradesh" should be "respondents in Lucknow district, Uttar Pradesh" * "It is used to simply and present the data." Should be "It is used to simplify and present the data." * "and the it should be shut downed." Should be "and it should be discontinued." * Formulas missing or incomplete (e.g., Garrett ranking formula placeholder not completed)   **Results and Discussion:**   * "Cost Befit Ratio" should be "Cost-Benefit Ratio" (This typo occurs multiple times across Tables 2 and 3) * Inconsistent use of percentage symbols – e.g., “20.19” vs “20.19%” – needs to be standardized. * Poor table formatting (e.g., Table 3 has inconsistent alignment, spacing, and formatting between “MODERN” and “TRADITIONAL” sections) * "All Total" instead use “Total" or "Overall Total" * "Wholesaler (33.26)" under “Traditional” table – appears to be a typographical error. This is duplicated from the trader row.   **Garrett Ranking (Table 5):**   * Good content but lacks clarity in explanation of scoring process (e.g., mention of conversion formula is incomplete in methodology).   **Conclusion:**   * "The study highlights the critical economic dynamics..." here "dynamics" is vague; better to specify: "economic relationships and constraints" * "supermarket-driven system achieved the highest cost-benefit efficiency." consider adding numerical support for emphasis. | All the correction in methodology, results and conclusion has been made in the manuscript. |
| Optional/General comments | * Tables have alignment and formatting issues (e.g., Table 3 layout needs standardization). * Units (% and ₹) are used inconsistently across tables. * Better visualization (bar charts, stakeholder diagrams) could improve interpretation. * The conclusion is aligned with the findings, but recommendations should be more actionable. | All the inconsistency has been addressed in the new manuscript |
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| **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)*  *All the suggestions which were important had already been changed and all the inconsistency has been corrected, few places like additional information regarding materials and methods are not necessary were remained unchanged.*  I am eagerly waiting my manuscript to be published in your journal. |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | No, there are no ethical issues and no conflict of interest with the authors |