

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_116267</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Economics of capsicum and tomato crops production under Protected Cultivation in the regions of Kalyana-Karnataka</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The manuscript develops a theme of local interest and economic importance for the region.</p> <p>Suggested: Economic aspects of production of pepper and tomato crops in Kalyana-Karnataka regions.</p> <p>The abstract should delve deeper into the problem and justification of this study. It does not include important methodological aspects.</p> <p>The manuscript contains all the corresponding items, however, each of them needs serious adjustments.</p> <p>To be scientifically correct, the research needs to complement the methodology and especially the analysis of the information.</p> <p>The quality and quantity of references are not the most appropriate. Most of the manuscript presents a lot of information without references.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>It is recommended that you review the English throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The research develops an interesting topic from an economic point of view for crops such as paprika and tomatoes. However, the way they present the manuscript and develop the methodological component is not the most scientifically correct.</p> <p>The title should be modified to make it more striking and, if possible, include the scientific name of the species studied. The abstract must clearly show the problem and the justification of the research. In this item, the methodologies must include the variables that were evaluated and how they were analysed, and then present the results and conclude with the objective of the research and its impact.</p> <p>Keywords are not included, which are very important to achieve greater visibility of the research and the article.</p> <p>The introduction presents a lot of information without bibliographical references; background studies in the international and regional context that support the arguments presented are not included.</p> <p>The methodology does not include references from where the procedures were taken or adapted. It is suggested to include a table or map that shows the georeferencing of production systems. Make a more detailed description of the evaluated variables. Include the corresponding statistical analyses.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>The results and discussion section, the results are presented in a very general way and there is no in-depth discussion of them from the economic, social and agronomic point of view, nor do they include comparative studies that show the real impact of the findings of the investigation.</p> <p>The conclusions should be reviewed to show the real impact of the results and the applicability of the research.</p> <p>Review other comments and observations in the manuscript.</p>	
--	--	--

**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>Ana Cruz Morillo Coronado</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia, Colombia</b>