

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_116972
Title of the Manuscript:	The extent of adoption of scientific muga culture technology by the muga rearers of the Sonitpur district of Assam
Type of the 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory 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>Compulsory Review Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Write some phrases in this manuscript) R/ the manuscript is important for this region of India applying modern technologies for cultivation 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title) R/ proper title, on the internet there are several works on the subject, which can facilitate the expansion and updating of this manuscript. This title is according to others already published on the subject in the region under study. 3. Is the summary of the article comprehensive? R/ The summary was not prepared according to the Journal guidelines and should be correctly corrected, adjusted the Journal guidelines. 4. Are subsections and the structure of the manuscript appropriate? R/ the manuscript does not follow the guidelines of the Journal and was therefore not subdivided into subsections for its writing; Were only divided into the general items of all scientific article. 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? R/ no, the manuscript has errors that must be corrected for its possible publication. EX. Poorly elaborate summary, must be corrected; Bibliographic references all wrong and outdated, many years of published, tables with presentation errors that must be corrected; 6. Are references enough and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, mention in the review form. R/ the references were 8 on the list. All wrong in their planning were placed in alphabetical order and must be in order of appearance in the text. Delayed publications, only a reference and from the year 2019, the rest was under this year. The annual media of the reference is from 2009. A reference is from 1996. On the internet there are publications on the most up - to -date topic. Run. <p>(In addition to the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) R/ this manuscript must be reformulated adjusted with the Journal guidelines. It usually got many mistakes for not using the guidelines of the Journal.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>MINOR REVIEW COMMENTS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the language quality of the article in the article suitable for academic communications? R/ The used English language should be revised because some words that are poorly written appear, this must be corrected. For the others the English language is suitable for academic communication among scientific. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Anselmo Enrique Ferrer Hernandez
Department, University & Country	Havana University, Cuba