

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_96185
Title of the Manuscript:	A study on Profile Characteristics of rice and maize and Farmers in the state of Nagaland
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:

(<https://www.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1- The manuscript is important for scientific research and community 2- The title is suitable; I suggest some amendments to be read as follows: A study on the Profile Characteristics of Maize Farmers in the State of Nagaland, India 3- The abstract is comprehensive and reflects the content of the research 4- The structure and the chapters of manuscript is appropriate, the methodology, results, and discussion are outstanding, but the conclusion is written in away like the abstract and should be changed. 5- Yes the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6- The references are sufficient but should be written according to the recommendation of this journal, i. e number in bracket []. In addition to that three references were found in the reference list and not exist in the text either should be added to the text or deleted.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Some grammar and spelling mistakes have been pointed out in the text	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elsamani Omer Amasaib
Department, University & Country	University of Khartoum, Sudan