

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_119637
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL LAND POLICY AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN TANZANIA: EVIDENCE FROM MBEYA REGION
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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>	<p>Lake of scientific approaches and methods.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Respected Editor,</p> <p>Having conducted a thorough study of this manuscript, I have identified the need for major revisions.</p> <p>Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Line numbers are missing, which would simplify the review process. (2) The aim of the study is not adequately justified in the introduction section. (3) The objective of the study in the last paragraph of the National Land Policy review is unclear and difficult to understand. (4) The applied method for analysis should be briefly explained in the introduction section. (5) Methodology: No mathematical or statistical models have been explained. (6) Results and Discussion: The response rate needs clarification, including a justification of how it was calculated. (7) Sources for Tables 1, 2, and 3 are missing. (8) The presentation of the paper is very poor. (9) There is a lack of novelty in the study. (10) The specific conclusions of the study are not clearly stated. (11) There are no proper recommendations for researchers, policymakers, and practical applications of the study. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Ok</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Divya Prakash Mohabey
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Technology, India