

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_120686
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification and Socio-Economics of Agroforestry Systems in Rural Areas of Jogindernagar in Mandi district of Himachal Pradesh
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript displays good and useful information, but the scope of the analysis presented is very limited, thereby reducing its scientific weight. This paper only identifies agroforestry systems and socio-economic status and is not equipped with a deeper description of the implications of these data. For example, elaboration on the correlation between socio-economic status and the existence of existing agroforestry was not carried out. Apart from that, it was also mentioned about the "side jobs" that the respondent farmers had. How does the contribution between agroforestry results and income from side jobs compare to the socio-economic status of farmers? Table 4 shows that the average annual income/person of marginal farmers is higher than that of small and medium farmers. This data is actually interesting and therefore needs to be elaborated to produce information that is more useful for readers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title used is quite appropriate but I suggest another title, namely "Identification of Agroforestry Systems and Socio-Economic Status of Farmers in Jogindernagar Rural Area of Mandi district of Himachal Pradesh"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract in this manuscript does not cover all the information needed, especially the methods used clearly. Apart from that, the results on the economic aspect have not been shown. In this abstract it is also necessary to write a few follow-up recommendations.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes appropriate.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The information presented in this text is quite good and can be used as basic data for policy makers. Unfortunately, this research does not explain in more depth the implications of the data obtained. Therefore, I hope that this text can be refined further.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	50% of the references used are old references (> 10 years), therefore in my opinion they are not suitable enough for writing a good manuscript	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Alfred Umbu Kuala Ngaji
Department, University & Country	State Agricultural Polytechnic of Kupang, Indonesia