

ReviewForm 1.7

JournalName:	JournalofScientificResearchandReports
ManuscriptNumber:	OriginalManuscript_JSRR_118125
Titleof theManuscript:	IdentificationoftheConstraintsPerceivedbyFarmersin ProductionandMarketingofBetelVinesin BankuraDistrictofWestBengal
Typeof the Article	---

[ReviewForm 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>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>Being the focus of study a plant with commercial traits, the study provides poor information in the title much more than to be a qualitative study for a commercial plant, the manuscript is not important for the scientific community.</p> <p>NO more comments on this section.</p> <p>NO more comments on this section.</p> <p>NO more comments on this section.</p> <p>NO more comments on this section.</p> <p>NO more comments on this section.</p> <p>NO more comments on this section.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>NO more comments on this section.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides an over-extended document for that is a qualitative study for a commercial plant, that is an agronomic trait which is offered and bought in the market, rendering a document with too much bias, that is, being a qualitative manuscript the length of the same could be interpreted as errors in methodology, data collection, processing, and report meaning that the planification and organization of the research might be containing errors which outlook in the writing of the manuscript as perceived hereby. The manuscript therefore does not seem to fit the title of the journal which it is intended to be published and provides too much editorial effort and fits no review whatsoever for that the manuscript itself provides clues for a biased research implying lack of preparation of the person involved, poor funding, but above all a miscalculation in the planification for that the results might be of local utility but does not even fit an international peer review, nor possibly for the title of the journal hereby, nor consideration for publicity of the data hereby reviewed. Caution should be taken given the status of the manuscript in actual review and consideration for review regarding that the hereby comments present clues for considering questioning the scientific status of the authors.</p>	

[ReviewForm 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:	Edwin Fernando Vásquez
Department, University & Country	Peru