

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_95292
Title of the Manuscript:	Agroforestry assisted Zero Budget Natural Farming: Challenges & Implications for Ecosystem Restoration & Doubling the Farmers' Income
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajraf.com/index.php/AJRAF/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes</p> <p>1. Each part of the article is designed well that developed with necessary details. 2. The study is most important for the current time in order to establish the agricultural activities. 3. Author has to revise it once that explanation for all the abbreviations given or not when it first interpreted in the sentence. 4. Given graphical presentation is not a reflection of the contents. And while it related to data that missing in the contents. 5. Sources of tables and graphs d picture is missing. 6. Only the given pictures and tables are seems like apt to the study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. If the journal following a limited words and pages. The respected editorial team has to check because it seems that it crossed a maximum level. 2. The work is seems like not a original work from author, many content is taken from different sources. Which means, the contribution of author is not seen any where.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	T. Amose
Department, University & Country	Madurai Kamaraj University, India