

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_ACRI_117702
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review on Levering Technology for Sustainable Development in Agricultural Extension Program
Type of the Article	Review Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>)

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important because of the method used to observe amaranth. Shows how different methods vary each seed.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is suitable for content.</p> <p>3. Yes, it is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Are appropriate to the content.</p> <p>5. Yes, it is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. They are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>I would suggest improving the whole review.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>It is suitable for academic communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In some topics improve writing-grammar, spelling, punctuation, conciseness, choice of words. so improve the abstract.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nayara Arroxelas dos Santos Siqueira</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil</b>