

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_127822
Title of the Manuscript:	Social Status of Women and their Traditional Ecological Knowledge in Chakrata District, Dehradun, Uttarakhand: A Study
Type of the Article	Review 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 (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Scientifically it is not a new study. It is combination of two or three earlier studies. Absent the ecological data in entire study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Present status of women and their traditional ecological knowledge in Chakrata district, dehradun, UK: A study	
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 incomplete. In abstract traditional ecological knowledge portion is not discuss.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes But here more focus on socio economic condition of women and not to the ecological knowledge.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes Singh KK (1997) is old and can be replaced by any one new reference.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Full form of ASL and NW is not mention.	

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:	Kanhiya Mahour
Department, University & Country	R.P.P.G.College, CSJM University, India