



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_36739
Title of the Manuscript:	Indigenous Technical Knowledge and Practices followed by Pastoralists for the treatment of livestock diseases in hills of Jammu & Kashmir State in India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	See review	Respected sir, i have gone through your corrections and suggestions. i have made changes according to your guidance. 1.Sir block is demarcated by the govt as a group of villages 2..prior information was taken by leading ITK users
Minor REVISION comments	See review	taken by most popular ITK users and on their opinion and as I am myself from the same area villages were selected where ITK was extensively used.3. interview schedule was made in English but it was interpreted in local language while conversation and results were again written in English.
Optional/General comments	See review	English 4.i have corrected grammatical mistakes as mentioned by you. Thanking you sir for your important suggestions.

REVIEW

This manuscript contributes data on plant-related ethnoveterinary practices in several Indian territories. The work is well designed, the methodology is adequate and seems to have been correctly employed, and the results are interesting, and discussed with the help of a pertinent literature set. The subject falls within the scope of the journal and it represents a sectorial ethnobotanical approach, which is still much needed in ethnobotany and ethnopharmacology. I find the manuscript potentially worthy of publication in the Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology, but I believe it cannot be accepted as it is, but only after a revision that I qualify as minor or median, and I find feasible, not implying new field work. I provide the authors with some comments to assist them in building an improved version.

- 1.- The geopolitical meaning and reach of the term "block" should be precised.
- 2.- The authors write "they selected villages where indigenous technical knowledge was extensively used". How did they evaluated this for the selection? In fact, this is already a part of an ethnobotanical prospection.
- 3.- The authors state having used a structured interview schedule. It would be perhaps interesting providing it as an annex, as a possible model for further research elsewhere.
- 4.- When describing the ethnic group(s) dealt with in this work, some information on the language(s) its(their) people speak would be interesting.
- 5.-. In the description of the study area, a brief allusion to the plant landscape in each studied zone would be informative.
- 6.- The herbarium where the vouchers have been deposited must be mentioned in the methodology, with indication of its international acronym, if any.
- 7.- In the methodology, the language(s) in which the interviews were performed and the need (or not) of interpreters should be mentioned.
- 8.- The distribution of informants' genders (number and/or percentage of male and female) should be indicated in the methods.
- 9.- Use the plant authorities only the first time every plant is quoted in the text and in the taxon column of table 1. Be sure all taxa bear authorities (*Tamarindus indica* does not in the table, for instance). Provide the authorities of each taxon with authors' names as in the International Plant Names Index (<http://www.ipni.org/ipni/authorsearchpage.do>). For instance, Linn. and Willd should not be used (but L. and Willd.).



SDI Review Form 1.6

10.- In table 1, the language which the local plant names belong to should be indicated.

11.- In table 1, the frequency of citation of each plant or use by the informants should be indicated.

12.- In table 1 use g instead of gm as the abbreviation for grams.

13.- Explain the meaning of ROP. In addition, clarify the equivalence of ITK (according to the title it would be indigenous technical knowledge, but in the text the authors write "indigenous knowledge (ITK) practices").

14.- Write "*Cedrus*" instead of "*cedrus*". In general, carefully revise the text to avoid these and other similar mistakes (and with initial capital after a dot in an authority's abbreviation and others). Do not use capital letters unless in proper names or when starting sentences; for instance "Ethno-veterinary practices" (not "Practices"), "foot and mouth" (not "Foot and Mouth"), "indigenous technical practices" (in the title "Indigenous technical practices"; not "Indigenous Technical Practices". Revise all the text or, better, make it revised by an English native speaker with botany knowledge; I am not a native English speaker and I agree that scientific English is not Shakespeare's English, but I see doubtful constructions, such as "results... have been presented in table 12 (results have not been, but are presented) or "plants were being used", among others.