

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_116119</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Water chestnut - an aquatic crop of high nutritional and economical importance: A Conceptual Note</b>
Type of the Article	

**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><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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>No – this does not seem to be a concept, rather a review or guidelines on farming practices</b></p> <p><b>No – the format is not according to the journal's guidelines. It can be more comprehensive – there is a lot of information in the paper that is not mentioned in the abstract, such as the fact that there are thornless lines and that it can be incorporated in bioculture projects.</b></p> <p><b>No – the sections can be better set out. There are repeats and sometimes the line of thought in one paragraph gets mixed up with another idea.</b></p> <p><b>No – Although the information seem to be important, it is difficult to decide what exactly this is. A guideline for farmers? A review of current farming practices? The merits of the new thornless variety? Because it seems NOT to be conceptual</b></p> <p><b>This reads like a review, though for that I would think that 8 reference articles are too few.</b></p> <p><b>No. I found information on pollination by a quick internet search, even though the author said that the pollinating vectors were unknown.</b></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>No. Please stick to the SI units. The author jumps from meters to feet. Economic values should be understandable for a global reader – please give dollar ratios for the local currency. Please see my suggestions in track changes.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The information in this manuscript seems to be important. BUT</p> <p>From the internet: A concept paper/note is a brief paper written around a research question before undertaking the research. It can be seen as a pre-proposal document that is about two or three pages in length providing key details about the research, such as the question, purpose, and methods.</p> <p>Thus – this manuscript is NOT a concept(nal – which should be more graphic?) note. Why should a concept note be published at all? Surely a concept is a motivation for research (and funding) which still has to be undertaken?</p> <p>Maybe change the title. It reads (in some parts) as a review of current (accepted) farming practices, but on the other hand it could be changed to a guideline for farmers. I do not know anything about water chestnuts, but from an agricultural viewpoint I do know that acceptance of anything new (the thornless chestnut) or methods (farming in a pond, vs harvesting from nature) is often not easily accepted by the farmers. Thus, writing our guidelines for the farming of this crop, could be very much needed. But, this will have to be rewritten. For instance: how deep should the pond/bund be? What form of fertiliser (just saying NPK is not saying anything – it can be in many different forms and different ratios), which pesticides (many glyphosate formulas are prohibited in water bodies). If however, this is changed into a review, the reference list should be expanded (it should be expanded in any case).</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>Anélia Marais</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>South Africa</b>