

Review form 1.7

Journal name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript number:	Ms_IJECC_98663
Manuscript Title:	Agroforestry system assessment on the socioeconomic status of farmers in Azamgarh district, Uttar Pradesh
Item Type	

General guideline for the peer review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that NO manuscript should be rejected solely on the basis of "lack of novelty", as long as the manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound. For the complete guide to the peer review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

[Review form 1.7](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	reviewer comment	Author comment (if you agree with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors are required to write their comments here)
<p>Mandatory REVIEW Feedback</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article complete? 4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have any suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form. <p><u>(Other than the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers can provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript reveals that: As for the keywords, they are raised correctly within a universal language. It is suggested to leave as Socioeconomics and increase Society. The background of the study is raised correctly, it can be seen how agroforestry is not something new; now, it is resumed with more force within a context that improves the quality of economic and labor life of the farmers in this area; The problem aims to show the favorable or unfavorable connection between agroforestry and agricultural land. These premises are justified with an important literature. The methodology determines the context of the study and the population selected for it; It would be important to indicate in more detail the design found in the summary of this work. The quantitative - descriptive method and its techniques are clear and precise for the investigation. It would be interesting to formulate the method or formula to apply for the interpretation of the results. The results reveal important findings on this topic, despite the fact that they are only compared with one author. This indicates that it may be an original study. It would be good to indicate the difficulties if they existed in the process; In the same way, it is essential to propose possible lines of research based on the study. The conclusions show significant contributions in improving the quality of life, ecological and ecosystem care, providing job stability and therefore economic. However, this can be counteracted with the proposed objective, but since it does not exist, the scope of the investigation cannot be evidenced. 2. The title is relevant to the study 3. The summary shows a clear methodological process of the investigation with an experimental design by blocks as well as selected sectors; The results of the study are presented with a brief conclusion of benefit for the agricultural field. However, it is necessary to state the objective of the investigation. 4. The structure of the writing is conducive to the requirement of scientific articles. 5. The writing is scientifically appreciable for the results found and the findings that contribute to the quality of life and care of the ecosystem. In addition, the investigative effort is supported by specialized literature revealing a rigorous academic aspect. 6. The references present an acceptable percentage of updated texts and another good part of works that exceed the last 5 years that are required in this type of research. It is recommended that there be at least between 40 - 50 references so that the study is strengthened with abundant specialized literature that supports the determined results or 	

Review form 1.7

	findings. However, it is important to take into account the requirement of the Journal to be published.	
Minor REVIEW Feedback 1. Is the quality of the language/English of the article adequate for scholarly communications?	It's appropriate	
<u>Optional/General comments</u>		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador