

BPI Review Form 070520

Book Name:	<u>Research Advances in Environment, Geography and Earth Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1472
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review on Agroforestry Systems Prevailing in Garhwal Himalayas
Type of the Article	Book chapter

BPI Review Form 070520

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (If agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive review of the diverse agroforestry systems in the Garhwal Himalayas. By highlighting traditional practices and their benefits, it contributes valuable insights into sustainable land use, biodiversity conservation, and local livelihoods. This information can aid in developing more effective agroforestry models and supporting food security and environmental sustainability in similar regions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	The title "A Review on Agroforestry Systems Prevailing in Garhwal Himalayas" is suitable as it clearly indicates the focus of the paper on reviewing agroforestry systems in a specific region.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	No, the abstract could be more comprehensive. It should include: Objective: Clearly state the main goal of the review. Methods: Briefly mention the approach or scope of the review. Key Findings: Highlight the main findings or insights. Significance: Explain the importance of the review for the field. Adding these elements will provide a clearer overview of the paper's purpose, methodology, and contributions.	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	No, the English quality of the article could be improved for scholarly communication. Suggestions: Grammar and Syntax: Correct grammatical errors and awkward phrasing (e.g., "a sharply increasing population hasn't not pressured" should be "a sharply increasing population has not only pressured"). Clarity: Ensure sentences are clear and concise. Avoid redundant phrases and ensure technical terms are used correctly. Consistency: Maintain consistent terminology and formatting throughout the manuscript. References: Ensure all references are formatted correctly and consistently. These improvements will enhance the clarity and professionalism of the manuscript.	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	- Abstract: Needs more detail on objectives, methods, key findings, and significance. - Introduction: Provides a good background but could better define the study's scope and objectives. - Traditional Agroforestry Systems: Informative but lacks specific examples and data; needs more clarity and depth. - Present Agroforestry Systems: Useful but could benefit from more detailed analysis and context. - Intercropping MAPs: Relevant but should include more specific examples and data on plant species. - Conclusion: Summarizes key points but needs a stronger emphasis on future research directions and practical implications.	

BPI Review Form 070520

Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	The references in the manuscript appear relevant but could benefit from some improvements: - Recency: Ensure the references include recent studies to reflect current trends and advancements in agroforestry. - Sufficiency: Verify that the references comprehensively cover the main topics discussed, including recent research and reviews. - Formatting: Check that all references are consistently formatted according to the journal's guidelines. Adding more recent and diverse sources will enhance the manuscript's credibility and relevance.	
--	--	--

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:	Jayakiran Reddy E
Department, University & Country	Sreenidhi Institute of Science and Technology, India