|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Book Name: | [Business, Management and Economics: Research Progress](https://www.bookpi.org/bookstore/product/business-management-and-economics-research-progress-vol-1/) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_BPR\_** **3272** |
| Title of the Manuscript:  | **Empowering Rural Entrepreneurship: The Impact of Tasar Sericulture and Pradan in Jharkhand, India** |
| Type of the Article | **Book chapter** |

|  |
| --- |
| 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, *Empowering Rural Entrepreneurship: The Impact of Tasar Sericulture and Pradan in Jharkhand, India*, is of significant importance to the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive overview of how traditional practices like Tasar sericulture contribute to rural entrepreneurship and socio-economic development in India, particularly among marginalized groups. It highlights the role of NGOs like Pradan and government bodies in creating sustainable livelihoods, making it relevant for studies on rural development and socio-economic policies. I appreciate the manuscript for its emphasis on the empowerment of rural communities through innovative approaches, such as the private grainage model, which ensures disease-free silk seed production. However, the paper could be improved by including primary data or field observations to strengthen its impact​. |  |
| **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 manuscript is comprehensive in presenting the key aspects of Tasar sericulture and its socio-economic impact on rural communities in Jharkhand. It outlines the cultural significance, production statistics, and the role of NGOs like Pradan in fostering entrepreneurship and socio-economic development. However, a few suggestions could enhance its clarity and completeness:1. Clarify Key Challenges: The abstract briefly mentions challenges but could be more specific. Including details about key obstacles, such as the shortage of disease-free layings (DFLs) or market connectivity issues, would provide a balanced perspective.
2. Highlight Methodology: While the impact and significance are well-covered, mentioning the methodological approach (quantitative/qualitative data collection) could improve the scientific rigor and guide readers on how the conclusions were reached.
3. Explicit Outcomes: Including specific outcomes such as the measurable success of Pradan's interventions (like income increases, job creation statistics, etc.) could make the abstract more impactful and data-driven.
4. Mention Policy Implications: Adding a line about the potential policy implications or recommendations derived from the study would emphasize the manuscript's broader relevance to stakeholders in rural development.

These adjustments could make the abstract more precise and informative. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | The manuscript *"Empowering Rural Entrepreneurship: The Impact of Tasar Sericulture and Pradan in Jharkhand, India"* has an overall appropriate structure and use of subsections. It is well-organized and follows a logical flow from introduction to conclusions. However, there are a few areas where improvements can be made for clarity and cohesion:Strengths of Structure:1. Clear Abstract: The abstract gives a comprehensive overview of the study's objectives, findings, and significance.
2. Introduction: Provides a strong background on Tasar sericulture, its cultural importance, and economic impact, setting a solid foundation for the rest of the paper.
3. Literature Review: The review of previous research is thorough, covering important contributions and gaps in the field.
4. Methodology: The description of both qualitative and quantitative data collection is appropriate and necessary for understanding how the study was conducted.

Suggestions for Improvement:1. Subsection on Challenges (Constraints):
	* While the section on the constraints of Tasar sericulture is important, it could be more integrated into the broader narrative of the manuscript. Adding it as a dedicated Challenges subsection within the discussion would enhance its impact.
2. Separation of Discussion and Results:
	* The paper currently mixes results and analysis. It would be clearer if the results (quantitative and qualitative findings) are separated from discussion, which should focus on interpreting those results in the context of existing research and providing recommendations.
3. Policy and Practical Implications:
	* While the manuscript touches on policy aspects, a dedicated subsection at the end focusing on implications for policy and future research could be beneficial. This would allow stakeholders to understand how the research could inform broader rural development strategies.
4. Conclusion Section:
	* The conclusion should emphasize key takeaways from the findings and suggestions for future work. While the existing conclusion is strong, it could be more succinct and directly highlight the study’s contribution to the scientific community and policy.

By refining these sections and clearly separating results from analysis, the manuscript’s structure would become more cohesive and impactful. |  |
| **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 appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its well-structured methodology and use of both qualitative and quantitative data. The study draws on reliable secondary data sources, including government reports and Pradan's annual reports, which are credible for assessing the socio-economic impact of Tasar sericulture. Additionally, the manuscript provides clear statistics on silk production, employment figures, and income generation, which add empirical validity to its findings. The discussion of challenges, such as the shortage of disease-free layings and market issues, reflects a comprehensive understanding of industry-specific constraints, demonstrating a balanced and critical approach. These factors support the manuscript’s scientific rigor and reliability. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | The manuscript includes a sufficient number of references, which cover relevant studies on Tasar sericulture, rural entrepreneurship, and socio-economic development. However, many references are older or rely on reports that may not fully reflect the most recent trends or technological advancements in the field. To strengthen the paper's relevance, it could benefit from the inclusion of more recent studies and data.Suggestions for Additional References:1. Recent Trends in Sericulture and Technology: Adding references from recent years (2020-2023) on advancements in sericulture technology and rural development could provide a more up-to-date perspective. For example, papers discussing innovations in silk seed production or entrepreneurial models in rural India would enhance the technological angle.
2. Policy and Developmental Impact: Including more recent government reports or publications related to rural entrepreneurship, especially post-COVID, could offer insights into how the sector has adapted to recent challenges.

If possible, incorporating studies or reports that reflect the latest developments in rural livelihood schemes and entrepreneurial ecosystems would add greater depth to the manuscript's analysis and ensure that it remains aligned with current scientific discourse. |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language of the manuscript is generally **clear and appropriate** for scholarly communication. It employs formal and academic vocabulary, making it suitable for the target audience. However, there are a few areas where the **English quality** could be improved for better clarity and flow:**Strengths:*** **Technical Terms**: The use of technical terms related to sericulture and rural entrepreneurship is accurate and contributes to the manuscript's scholarly tone.
* **Structure and Coherence**: The paper follows a logical structure, making it easy to follow the argument and understand the research findings.

**Areas for Improvement:**1. **Repetitive Phrasing**: Some phrases and terms are repeated frequently (e.g., Tasar sericulture, empowerment, etc.), which can be streamlined for smoother reading.
2. **Sentence Structure**: A few sentences are lengthy and could be broken down into shorter, more concise statements for clarity.
3. **Minor Grammatical Errors**: There are minor grammatical errors, such as misplaced commas or awkward phrasing, that could be revised for greater precision.

In general, the manuscript is suitable for scholarly communications, but minor revisions in phrasing and sentence structure would enhance readability and ensure a professional, polished presentation. |  |
| Optional/General comments | The manuscript, *"Empowering Rural Entrepreneurship: The Impact of Tasar Sericulture and Pradan in Jharkhand, India,"* is a valuable contribution to the fields of rural development, socio-economic studies, and sustainable entrepreneurship. It successfully highlights the role of traditional practices like Tasar sericulture in fostering economic growth and empowerment among marginalized communities, particularly in rural India. The integration of government support and NGO initiatives, such as Pradan’s efforts, is well-documented, and the data presented strengthens the argument.**Areas of Strength:*** **Comprehensive Overview**: The manuscript offers a detailed account of the Tasar sericulture industry and its socio-economic importance, making it informative for both policymakers and researchers.
* **Data-Driven**: The inclusion of empirical data adds credibility to the findings and conclusions, enhancing the manuscript's impact.
* **Focus on Rural Empowerment**: The emphasis on rural entrepreneurship, particularly the empowerment of tribal and marginalized communities, is a strong point that aligns with global development goals.

**Areas for Improvement:*** **Structure**: While the structure is logical, clearer separation of **results** from the **discussion** section would improve the flow.
* **Language**: Minor grammatical revisions and reducing repetitive phrasing would improve the manuscript’s readability.
* **References**: Adding more recent references and studies would ensure the manuscript remains relevant in light of the latest advancements in rural development and sericulture.

Overall, the manuscript is strong and has significant potential to contribute to both academic and policy discussions in its field. |  |
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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)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?**  | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |
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