

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_111686
Title of the Manuscript:	Integrated farming systems for environment sustainability – A Comprehensive Review
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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>The manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>The title of the article needs some adjustment. Title is the face of the manuscript, It should be a minimum of 15 words and maximum of 20 words.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is not comprehensive as some sections are not covered. Include methodology. Follow the following suggestion in your writing of the abstract. (Context, Content, Conclusion).</p> <p>THE ORGANISATION OF THE MANUSRIPT IS KEY IN SCIENTIFIC WRITING: Use IMRaD STRUCTURE</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct subject to major adjustments to include updated sections in item 3 above and more importantly organisation of the manuscript..</p> <p>The references are availed. However, some references are not well formatted to APA format. Any reference more than five years if not theory is not considered current.</p> <p>Choose one style of reference don't mix: If APA, Chicago, Havard, Vancouver or MLA.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The abstract is supposed to be a short summary that sums up the research. It should summarize the separate sections and outline the study's contribution in relation to its conceptual, methodological as well as empirical approaches. It should therefore present all the elements of the study in a highly condensed form including its conclusions/recommendation.</p> <p>Title: 15 to 20 words long</p> <p>1.0 Introduction- what is known about the area of study, be current in your literature, what is unknown, identify the gaps in the literature and answer how the study will fill the current gap, explain the rational of the study</p> <p>1.1 Objective of the study</p> <p>1.2 Scope of the study</p> <p>1.3 Significance of the review</p> <p>2.0 Review of Literature -</p> <p>3.0 Methods : How data was accumulated,</p> <p>4.0 Results/findings: The presentation of the findings is not consistent with the journal style. NB: Objectives and findings /results discussion should relate.</p> <p>5.0 Conclusion- A conclusion should be terse in communicating three things to the reader—what is the memorable take-home message, what new findings have been added to the literature, and what</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	are the future perspectives in the field 6.0 Recommendations- provide future perspective Reference as per the guideline: choose one and don't mix the styles: APA, Chicago, Havard, Vancouver or MLA NB: THE ORGANISATION OF THE MANUSRIPT IS KEY IN SCIENTIFIC WRITING: Use IMRaD STRUCTURE	
--	---	--

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:	Dorothy Medza Tsuma
Department, University & Country	Management University of Africa, Kenya