

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125516
Title of the Manuscript:	Farm Women and Nutrition Gardens: Constraints and Suggestions
Type of the Article	Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses a critical gap in our understanding of constraints and suggestions, providing new insights that could inform future research and applications. The rigorous methodology and comprehensive data analysis enhance its credibility and potential impact. Personally, I appreciate the manuscript for its clarity and the way it challenges existing paradigms, prompting further exploration and discussion in the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No. Never start any sentence with number. Like 110 beneficiaries from each KVK were selected. Please correct it. Generally, a strong abstract should include the study's purpose, methods, key findings, and implications. If it lacks any of these components or is overly detailed in certain areas, I'd suggest adding purpose and implications points accordingly.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it is appropriate but if you can add please add tables of garet ranking calculations	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its well-defined research objectives and a rigorous methodology that includes appropriate experimental design and data analysis techniques. The use of reliable data sources and adherence to ethical guidelines further enhance its credibility. Additionally, the discussion of results is grounded in existing literature, providing a solid theoretical framework. Overall, the clarity in presenting findings and addressing potential limitations reinforces its scientific integrity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Please add some recent reviews from Journal of scientific research and reports minimum of 5-6 reviews	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. Yugender Reddy
Department, University & Country	Mallareddy University, India