

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAEES_113270</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PROFILE CHARACTERISTICS OF KHASI TRIBAL FARMERS ENGAGING IN COLLECTION AND MANAGEMENT OF NON-TIMBER FOREST PRODUCTS IN MEGHALAYA, INDIA</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, the manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the socio-economic and cultural characteristics of Khasi tribal farmers in Meghalaya, informing targeted interventions for sustainable livelihoods and environmental conservation efforts in tribal communities.</li> <li>2. Yes, the title "Profile Characteristics of Khasi Tribal Farmers Engaging in Collection and Management of Non-Timber Forest Products in Meghalaya, India" effectively reflects the content and focus of the manuscript. It accurately highlights the study's subject, population, and main activities. Therefore, it is suitable for the article's purpose.</li> <li>3. <b>The abstract of the article is lengthy at 313 words, which may deter some readers from engaging with the full article. To enhance its effectiveness and pique curiosity, it could be tailored to a more concise length of 240-250 words. The revised version would maintain the abstract's comprehensiveness while making it more accessible and enticing for readers to delve into the full article, thereby maximizing its impact and reach within the scientific community.</b></li> <li>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript follows a logical flow, beginning with an abstract summarizing the study, followed by sections covering introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. Each section provides clear delineation of the research process, findings, and implications, enhancing readability and comprehension.</li> <li>5. Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically sound. <b>However, to enhance clarity and visual representation of trends, data presented in tabular form should also be depicted graphically. This additional visualization will provide a clearer understanding of the trends and patterns observed in the data, improving the overall comprehensibility of the findings.</b></li> <li>6. <b>The references provided in the manuscript are insufficient and not sufficiently recent to fully support the study's findings. The author has only cited one reference in the study area, which is inadequate for providing a comprehensive understanding of the topic. Additionally, the overall number of references (21) is low, and only a small proportion (6) are from the last 4-5 years. To improve the robustness of the study, it is recommended to include a minimum of 4-5 additional recent references related to tribal farming, non-timber forest product management, socio-economic characteristics of indigenous communities, and related topics. This would enhance the credibility and relevance of the research findings by incorporating a broader range of perspectives and scholarly contributions.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>The manuscript requires meticulous revision to address the highlighted corrections and suggestions before it can be considered for publication. Improvements in grammar, clarity, and adherence to academic conventions, such as citation formatting and terminology consistency, are essential. Only after incorporating revisions should the manuscript be considered for publication</b></li> <li>2. <b>The language and English quality of the article are adequate for scholarly communications, albeit with room for improvement. While the text is generally clear and coherent, there are occasional instances of grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that could be refined for greater precision and readability. Overall, while the language quality meets the basic standards for scholarly communication, further refinement would elevate the article's clarity and impact within the academic community.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ummar Atta</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences &amp; Technology, India</b>