

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ CJUST_102709
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE LEVEL OF THE ANGANWADI WORKERS ON ICDS: A STUDY IN MANIPUR
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://journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, however it is basic. It will be more significant if the paper aims to develop an output that will give solution to the identified problem.</p> <p>Do not use abbreviations (ICDS) and change the knowledge into a more scientific concept</p> <p>Exploring the knowledge as stated in the abstract is not congruent to the result of the paper. Kindly rephrase the content of the abstract.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>It needed an in depth content of the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Include in the paper the gap of the study, the aim, the objective and the purpose. The limitations of the study is not mentioned in the background. Also in the analysis, add more explanation to the statistical treatment result that will give a clearer conclusion and recommendations in the output</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jocelyn Hipona
Department, University & Country	La Consolacion University, Philippines