

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125570
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of the impact of low tunnel technology on farm income of bottle gourd growers in the Bikaner district of Rajasthan
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 <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.	The article explores the impact of low tunnel technology on farm income of bottle gourd growers among the rainfed area of India. Its importance to know the economic and viability of the such low cost technology	
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.	Add results of significance of input used in Bottle gourd cultivation in low tunnel and open field conditions	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	In the manuscript, there are errors calculating percentage in table 1, there were also errors in writing units, such as the capitalization of the first word, missing spaces.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Write <i>et al.</i> in italic in review part	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language in the article reads more like a collection of reviews. The author should adopt a more scholarly tone, presenting the information with deeper analysis and critical insight rather than merely summarizing existing studies.	
Optional/General comments	The author should incorporate additional data-based reviews, specifically focused on the Indian context. Including more studies that highlight the unique agricultural, economic, and environmental conditions in India will provide a stronger foundation for the article and make the analysis more relevant to the target audience.	

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:	G. K. Bhabhor
Department, University & Country	Anand Agricultural University, India