



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_48672
Title of the Manuscript:	Construction and standardization of knowledge test to measure the level of knowledge of tribal farmers on seed banking
Type of the Article	

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Key words: Knowledge is repeated. Introduction: This topic should provide a brief literature survey. Therefore it is necessary to rewrite it.	Corrected in the manuscript I have rewritten and included brief literature in the Introduction
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The knowledge test developed was not applied in a tribal farmers for real, right? So, is it correct to say that it is highly stable and reliable based only in the highly significant value of reliability co-efficient? Think and discuss about that.	To find out the Reliability coefficient for knowledge test, it is applied to 30 number tribal farmers which was mentioned in the standardization of the test.

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>	No