

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_105724
Title of the Manuscript:	Pre and Post Evaluation of Nutrition Security in farm families from Nutrition Garden in Tonk district of Rajasthan
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.journalcjast.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)
<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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Manuscript important for scientific community</p> <p>2. Title suitable: this is the title proposal: Assessment of nutritional security status in farm households from nutrition garden in Tonk district of Rajasthan</p> <p>3. Abstract not comprehensive. It should be structured such as: Introduction, methods, results, conclusion and key words.</p> <p>4. Manuscript structure and subsections non appropriate: In the methodology, the study design, the sapling and the data collection and analysis not well identified.</p> <p>5. Manuscript scientifically correct but should undergo some major revisions. Avoid abbreviations in tables such as: Sno int tables one and 2. Avoid abbreviations in pictures such as Pic1, Separate results and discussion. Try to compare your result with other authors and contextualise your results.</p> <p>6. References sufficient and some are recent but not well presented. Use either Zotero or Mendeley for references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<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:	Simon Ilunga K.L
Department, University & Country	University of Lubumbashi, Democratic Republic of the Congo