

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_114149
Title of the Manuscript:	Resource use efficiency in carnation production under polyhouse conditions in Himachal Pradesh
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no clear problem statement or the current research background (specifically on the carnation production) for this study. No clear explanation on the need for this study to be conducted with the current research gap. • Inadequate of current and latest past studies pertaining to the study • Need to provide reasons and justifications for each of the methodological issues chosen for this study. Eg. the use of Cobb-Douglas production, the study on carnation production etc • Do interpret the results on the meaning on the results obtained rather than reporting it without any explanations • The conclusion need to cover how the results of this study can be used to narrow the current research gap (should have been identified in the problem statement/ background of the study). • Ensure that all the in-text citations are listed in the references list and vice-versa. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chiam CC
Department, University & Country	Malaysia