

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_123708
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Analysis of Environmental and Social Practices in the Sugar Industries of Brazil and Southern Maharashtra
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	I did not like this manuscript. Although topic is of great importance, the way it has been covered is not appropriate. It should be written properly. More data should be given in the manuscript. Some diagrams should also be added to the manuscript for better understanding of readers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. worldwide sugar business (as given in the abstract) doesn't include only two countries. A Comparative Analysis of Environmental and Social Practices in the Sugar Industries of Brazil and Southern Maharashtra, India	
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. abstract is poorly written, summary or highlight of all the sections in the manuscript should be given in the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	no	
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.	It is not clear, why these two areas have been selected for comparison. Effluent treatment plant fig has been given but no difference in both these areas in these plants have been covered. Only one comparative table has been given in the manuscript between these countries.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More references should be included in the manuscript. Literature review should be more comprehensive and more recent references should be added in the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments	No.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Manuscript can be revised in the major way and can be resubmitted. All the given comments above can be taken into the consideration before revision.	

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:	Sujata Sinha
Department, University & Country	Indian Council of Medical Research, India