



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_43187
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study of Supply Chain and Estimation of Post-Harvest Losses in Banana in Middle Gujarat
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1] Authors must follow the referencing style of the journal (Vancouver referencing style) 2] The first sentence in the introduction (line 23 &24) must be sourced. 3] The literature review appears to be focusing on peoples work rather than focusing on the topics under discussions which will then be supported by what people have found or done already. Authors must re-write the literature review to focus on the items under discussion whilst supporting with current and relevant references. 4] The methodology is a bit skeletal. Can authors do a proper write up of the methodology aspect. Again, what was the population of farmers, commissioners and traders at the study area? 5] Authors are strongly advised to separate the results from the discussion in order to do a proper discussion of the results. Currently the section is more of a description of the result with not strong discussion of the results. Authors must discuss their findings and back them with current and relevant literature. 6] The reference used is woefully indicate. Authors must add more (at least 20) current and relevant references from peer reviewed publications	1) Done 2) The sentence has been changed because of plagiarism detected. 3) Literature review has been deleted based on the suggestion of the other reviewer. 4) The methodology is in a very standard format, used by many researchers (S.S. Acharya). The population of the study cannot be given since it was unavailable. 5) Results are separated from discussion. 6) References has been changed.
Minor REVISION comments	1] If possible try to avoid using words in title sentence as key words. 2] Line 35 (post-loss should be post harvest loss). 3] Re-number the tables. The first table (at results & discussion) has no number and label. 4 All tables must sources to maintain consistency.	All the minor corrections have been done.
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>