

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_116074
Title of the Manuscript:	Traditional vs. Scientific Eri Silkworm Rearing: A Study in Bhubaneswar Zone
Type of the Article	

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. The manuscript is very important for scientific community. It ontologically covers an up-to-date topic observed among society. It is also epistemologically presented with clear method of obtaining, processing, and analysing the two types compared data. Besides, it axiologically points out the benefits of the research results for both theoretical development of the topic concerned and especially the benefit for the rural community in indreasing their income.</p> <p>2. The title is really suitable for it is an up-to-date title that reflects what the readers can obtain through a comparison between a traditional view and scientific view of the topic discussed.</p> <p>3. The abstract covers comprehensively the whole article presentation as it involves a short introduction of the topic, the purpose, the method, the benefits, and the concise results of the topic under research as well as important key words.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the writing are very appropriate including clear introduction sections, comprehensive review of literature with detail subsections, the methods used, comprehensive results presented in the form of tables and charts, conclusion/summary, supporting pictures, and references.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct since it meets the whole criteria needed. It presents a clear topic, real data obtained from a society, processed using clear method by applying relevant theories, and yields comprehensive results.</p> <p>6. The references are very sufficient and recent since they concern with not only relevant books but also recent journals as well as electronic references.</p> <p>The only thing is the summary. It might not be necessary to have a summary as the writing has already had a conclusion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The writing has a well-structured and high level of English and coherent presentation as well as selected and relevant vocabulary in accordance with the topic concerned. All this is suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In general, this writing is a well-organized manuscript based on an up-to-date topic relevant to provided data obtained from field research processed and analyzed using certain and relevant methods with the results important for both theoretical benefit and practical benefit.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Simon Sitoto
Department, University & Country	Hasanuddin University, Indonesia