

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_94873
Title of the Manuscript:	Cultural Knowledge of On-farm Tree Plantation in Rural Communities of Gurez Himalaya in India
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:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>There is need to revisit some of the sections of the report and these are, Abstract which is too shallow and lacking tangible facts basing on the findings and recommendations contained in the whole document, Introduction that is observed to contain some useful information but mixed up making it difficult to follow. The important information in the introduction like the problems, aim, objective etc need to be lined up well. The conclusion has some useful and important information but has not been well summarised basing on the aim of the research and the findings.</p> <p>All the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols should be written in full followed by the abbreviations/acronyms themselves when they appear in the document for the first time, thereafter, the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols can be used (e.g. NTFR, WMS)</p> <p>Proofreading of the whole document to correct the grammar, typos etc including rephrasing/reconstruction of some sentences as well as taking out repeated statements. This could also include rearranging the facts presented in the whole document for a good flow of information and easy understanding (See my comments in the main document especially the Introduction Section).</p> <p>Consider adding a section on the proposed way forward to the report to address some of the challenges and observations made during the study that have been mentioned in the report. The Conclusion Section has some facts that could be included in the proposed section.</p> <p>The conclusion part needs to be reviewed and it should be consistent with what has been provided in the whole document. It is not supposed to be a copy and paste of what is in the Results and Discussion sections but rather a summary of the findings which is also supposed to be part of the Abstract.</p> <p>Consider numbering the Reference Section as well just like the other Sections and Sub-Sections.</p> <p>Note that Reference 17 is confusing as there two years mentioned i.e. 1990 and 2022 and yet on 1990 is appearing under the references. Consider reviewing or providing clarification.</p> <p>There is need for consistency throughout the document when presenting issues (e.g. Table 2 and page 9 on ranges).</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Avoid making sentences that are not connecting very well as observed in Sections and sub-sections (see my comments in track changes).</p> <p>Consider re-allocating Figures/Tables in the document closer to where they have been introduced in the report for easy referencing (e.g. Figures 1 and 2). Also introduce figures or tables before and not after insertion.</p> <p>No mention has been made of the policy/policies existing in the country/province/district that can help in this initiative.</p> <p>No mention has been made in the document of the recommended tree species for the on the farm plantation to avoid other challenges that could be there.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Consider revising the title of the study by the addition of the country where it was carried out.</p> <p>Consider giving brief explanation of what it means by on-farm tree plantation. This can fit well in the introduction section.</p> <p>Give an explanation on WMS under sub-section 3.2 and what the values registered mean.</p> <p>I have made a number of comments under the compulsory, few ones in minor revision as well as optional/general sections; I feel the manuscript could be under the minor revision range as most of the facts presented need to be corrected/revised if considered to be making sense by the author. All in all, the manuscript needs to be repaired basing on the deficiencies, some of which have been mentioned in addition to the track changes provided in the attached document.</p> <p>It is a good study that can help in the management of the environment in general which when well administered, can help the global problem of climate change which becoming to be a threat to the present and future generations. This can also empower the rural communities economically. However, there is a need to provide more details to the study and this should include the problems/challenges as well as the proposed way forward based on the experience generated from the study and other studies done in the region and beyond. No mention is made of the existing policy/policies in the country that can help enforce what has been recommended in this study</p>	

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>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	James Peaches Phiri
Department, University & Country	Malawi