

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_113163
Title of the Manuscript:	Seaweed on productivity and profitability of major crops in India
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is scientifically important to the community The content of the manuscript seems to be of reviewed work. Therefore, I suggest that the title be changed to capture review.. for example; Review of seaweed.... Abstract is the summary of the entire work, but this abstract did not actually summarize the work, it more of presenting a foreward. The author should look deep into the work and come out with a better summary to present as abstract. Abstract should always carry in a brief; the main objective first, then the specific objectives, mothedology, results, conclusion and recommendations. Even scientific review write ups follow the same pattern. The subheadings/sections are not appropriate. After introduction, there should be methodology as subheading, then result presentation. The manuscript is scientifically correct References are sufficient and rescent. But I'm not okay with the method of referencing in the body of the work. Name of author and the year of publication e.g (Mshelizah, 2023) or (Mshelizah et al., 2021) should be presented after citations in the body of the work and not numbers (2, 3). I suggest APA style of referencing when listing the references 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The quality of English in the article is okay for scholarly communication	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The author should go through the manuscript again and effect the necessary corrections.	

PART 2:

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rejoice James Mshelizah
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Agriculture, Nigeria