Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Archives of Current Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ACRI_115389**
Title of the Manuscript:	**COW BASED PRODUCTS FOR SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE- A REVIEW**
Type of the Article	**Review**

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. The article involves important information for sustainability planning. Yet, the systematic outlay is problematic. The cow-based inputs seem to be considered as alternatives in India. The research evaluated and inserted within the review also focused on India. However, the regional dispersion was not mentioned in the content. 2. Concerned products are inputs as fertiliers/herbicides. Therefore, use of 'input' rather than 'product' can be suggested. 3. Abstract is expected to include objective – methodology (literature review for this article) – findings and inferences (suggestions for this article). The abstract misses this information. Just includes a conclusion sentence as 'Cow based products along with organic manures can be used in organic farming as an alternative to chemical fertilizers which helps in growth of the crop and provides eco-safety food.' It should be re-visited. 4. The systematic outlay needs to be revised. The effects were subdivided into two as effects on growth and yield. In these subdivisions, the relevant literature was summarised. Detailed plant – breeding information was inserted. However, the use of these research and its relation to un-mentioned Indian agriculture is missing. We can note this from the conclusion section as well. 5. Scientific outcomes of plant-breeding research referred are significant. However, as the use of this previous research is inorganized, it is not possible to follow up. 'What is the objective of this research?' is a question remained till the end of the paper. The conclusion also lacks provision of an overview. 6. Vast literature was used and referred. Rather than suggesting new articles – research, the authors are suggested to present their ideas – results driven in a proper way.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Rather than the English use, paper organization needs to be checked. Subsections include one paragraph only. This is also related to the paper organisation problems. So the content and its presentation should be checked completely.	
Optional/General comments	The research seems to contribute to the literature, but it needs to be reviewed and re-written. The paper needs to have an objective and some inferable outcomes that are not argumentative.	

Review Form 1.7

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Rahmiye Figen Ceylan**
Department, University & Country	**Akdeniz University, Turkey**