Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Archives of Current Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ACRI_122609**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A comprehensive coverage of Sngo lha or Mendok rgyaspa: the ethnic flower festival of Ladakh, India**
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.	**This article has only collected literature and compiled it, and has not seen any empirical research.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Fair**	
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.	**1. The discussion of research motivation and research methods can be strengthened. 2. Description of its innovation and contribution.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Fair There are too few empirical studies and only collection of literature, which fails to explain the contribution of existing literature.**	
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.	**NO**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**The article can specifically describe the results and findings of past literature research.**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**Fair**	
Optional/General comments	**Strengthen empirical explanation**	

Review Form 3

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:	**Po-Hsien Chiu**
Department, University & Country	**Cheng Shiu University, Taiwan**