

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_129366
Title of the Manuscript:	The Land of Four “Ts”; Dooras areas, 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper attempts to give an outline of the Dooras (also known as Dooars) region of India particularly emphasising on its four Ts i.e. Tea, Timber, Tourism and Tribals, which the region is known for. Doing this the paper has tried to shed light on the geography and climate, biodiversity, population structure as well as history of the region. Considering its four Ts, the region has immense socio-economic and political importance for India as well as for the world. The paper thus has a huge possibility to draw the attention of the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	NO Alternative Title – “Dooras: The Land of ‘Four Ts’ of 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.	The abstract is not comprehensive. Instead of juggling with multiple aspects, the author may set a clear-cut objective of the paper and present its key findings accordingly.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Scientifically, the manuscript can contribute to the academic body of knowledge if the data are presented in right way.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references (mostly collected from online sources) seem to be alright.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reference should be Amos 2024 ^[2] – p 2. 2. ‘was monopolised’ has been repeated – p 2. 3. The paper lacks clear purpose of discussion. 4. As the paper lacks clear-cut purpose, it is loaded with unrelated information from secondary sources, with no justifications of why they have been given. 5. There is also lack of clarity in the arrangement of the given information. 6. Conclusion seems to be abstract. No validity is given in the results/discussion section. 	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amit Kumar Kisku
Department, University & Country	Vidyasagar University, India