

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JSRR_118125
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of the Constraints Perceived by Farmers in Production and Marketing of Betel Vines in Bankura District of West Bengal
Type of the Article	Analytical study

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The subsection and the structure of the manuscript needs some correction. The study says the season of betel leaves of some States, but it missed some more States which also cultivate betel leaves particularly Tamil Nadu. The author has quoted 3 references in Tamil Nadu but has not given the season for Tamil Nadu</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>References are not covered fully, the author has given 20 references in the review of literature but given the details for only 10 references. The details about other authors are missing. Comprehensive references are needed. References are not in order according to the author's alphabet</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes it is good enough to give information to the reader</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Modifications in methodology and the results of the paper is needed. The paper is too lengthy in the methodology part. It has five pages but not clearly mentioned the objectives of the study. The methodology may be restricted to 2 to 3 pages. In the discussion and the results, there is no need to give tables as well as pictures. The pie chart may be avoided. This will help to reduce the length of the paper</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:	S. Krishnan
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu State Statistical Training Institute, India