

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_95221
Title of the Manuscript:	The Strategies of chromite terrace in Sukinda Valley; India
Type of the 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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. Maybe yes, but is not presented adequately presented 2. Maybe yes, but the content is not according with title 3. No, because is not identifiable the purpose of the study, neither the methodology and conclusions 4. Partially 5. No, because there is information that induce to think that is a review article but is included methodology that is not clear because the development of content is not structured according the summarized chart (figure 3) 6. No comments on this matter It is suggested redefine the structure of manuscript as review article (there have information that can support this or focuses in a specific point (only one objective as purpose of the study)	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	It is recommended re write the manuscript but previously is recommended to read the instructions for authors carefully	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Miguel Guzman-Rivero
Department, University & Country	Instituto de Investigaciones Biomédicas, Universidad Mayor de San Simón, Bolivia