

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | Journal of Scientific Research and Reports   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JSRR_102258   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | ANALYSIS OF PRODUCTION CONSTRAINTS AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES FOR ENHANCING YIELD OF SIKKIM MANDARIN ( <i>Citrus reticulata</i> ) |
| Type of the Article      | Review 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.journalsr.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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>1. <b>Subject of the manuscript is important for the scientific community. But the content has not justified the topic. It is not focused and there are no specific mitigation strategies were reviewed and recommended.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Title of the article is not appropriate for the content. It will be better if its title will be "Yield Constraints of Sikkim Mandarin (<i>Citrus reticulata</i>) and possible management strategies: A Review</b></p> <p>3. <b>Manuscript is scattered. It needs to be reviewed again and focus on the sequential flow and connection of the subjects reviewed in this manuscript.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes, it is ok.</b></p> <p>5. <b>The flow of the article is not appropriate; it needs to improve. If there will be discussion part before conclusion it will be better.</b></p> <p>6. <b>References are more or less sufficient. Because of the subject, it is ok. But in later time citrus fruit fly and nutrient management are the main issues of Mandarin orange in Sikkim, Nepal and similar situations. So, more reviews of references in those areas may improve the information and message of the manuscript.</b></p> <p>7. <b>Based on communication about the article, it might be written by a student of BSs. /MSc. Who are at the early stage of their scientific writing or learner. So I recommend reviewing him/her once again and trying to make it more informative and focused.</b></p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>1. Language is ok. With an additional discussion section, it will be more communicative.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>I recommend this manuscript to review again based on above mentions comments. Just to change the title and maintain sequential flow and inter-connection of the subjects it will be informative and useful for readers/users.</p>  |   |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Rajendra Uprety</b>                    |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Wageningen Univeristy, Netherlands</b> |