

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_EJNFS_117674
Title of the Manuscript:	UNLOCKING AGRICULTURAL POTENTIAL: AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF TRANSFORMING BARRAN LAND INTO LEAFY GREENS PRODUCTIVE ASSETS
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> <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><u>In overall, the writing is very poor technically. Especially, Methodology and Results are incomplete and unclear.</u></p>	<p>Q. 1. Yes I find the article important for the scientific community. It gives approximate profit levels of growing green vegetables of amaranth group. It also opens ways for comparison of various green vegetables with respect to profit and nutritive values and may help in reducing malnutrition and increasing household income of even poor families.</p> <p>Q. 2. yes the title is suitable, except that if the land is barren, it should be mentioned in the Methodology, which is not done.</p> <p>Q. 3. It is not so comprehensive. Relationship between amaranth and spinach should be shown. What are 5 greens? It should be clarified. Methodology and treatments not properly given. Whether it is a review article or a field work article not clear.</p> <p>Q. 4. Specific objectives are not completely mentioned. Some information to be included in introduction are given to Methodology. The subsection Result is missing. It should be separated from Methodology. Tables are not cited in text. Methodology of the experiment, treatments and replications, design plot size, etc are missing.</p> <p>Q. 5. Efforts are made but the manuscript is not completely scientifically correct. Explanations of Methodology and Results are not enough. The writing is not in proper chronology and sequence. Writing and grammar is also poor. In Table 3, data under various columns are mismatching.</p> <p>Q. 6. Majority of the references are old and in some cases references are missing. That is asked in the text. References are also not uniformly written.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes it is enough given that amendments should be made as suggested in the text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors should thoroughly amend the article as corrections and comments made in the text.</p> <p>Looks like a field study, but it is written as a review article too at the last sentence of the Abstract.</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:	Gopal Bahadur K. C.
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal Academy of Science and Technology, Nepal Development Research Institute, Nepal