

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_113013
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytosociological Analysis of Functional Components in Silvopastoral Land Use Systems of Himachal Pradesh, North Western Himalaya
Type of the Article	Research 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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>On Form</p> <p>Title</p> <p>It is necessary to specify the country in the title because not all readers know where the northwest of the Himalayas is located.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>The parts of the abstract are not identifiable.</p> <p>Material and methods</p> <p>Generally, in research articles carried out in the field, a location map is presented. This allows readers to visualize exactly the study locations. Then, a description of the said places is made in relation to the climate, population, environment, land, etc.</p> <p>On the background</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>- The authors do not clearly present the scientific problem they want to solve. Reading the title, readers wonder why do the authors want to do a phytosociological analysis of functional components of the silvopastoral land use systems of Himachal Pradesh? The answer to this question lets readers know what the scientific problem at hand is.</p> <p>- The authors certainly state in conclusion that: “In the past, no study has been carried out on the floristic and phytosociological diversity of the silvopastoral systems of Himachal Pradesh.” On the other hand, these same authors perhaps say as an objective that “Thus, to know the state of floristic and phytosociological diversity in these land use systems, a study was carried out between April 2018 and March 2022 in 12 selected villages of Himachal Pradesh.” These two statements seem contradictory. This is to the extent that, if the authors truly aim to know the state of floristic and phytosociological diversity, they must have a benchmark for comparison. They must refer to a preliminary study whose results can be comparable to theirs.</p> <p>- The authors do not specify the methods used to arrive at the results. Which is a failure because the abstract has essential parts including the methods.</p> <p>Material and methods</p> <p>The method is not clear. This does not make it easier to understand the work that was actually carried out.</p> <p>Results and discussion</p> <p>- In science, the results are presented in two (02) ways, either in the form of tables or in the form of figures. Then, analysis, interpretations and discussions are made based on said results.</p> <p>- The images (photos) presented by the authors are not meaningful. In principle, authors must</p>	<p>Title</p> <p>Revised as suggested and highlight in the manuscript.</p> <p>Phytosociological Analysis of Functional Components in Silvopastoral Land Use Systems of Himachal Pradesh, India</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>Revised as suggested and highlight in the manuscript.</p> <p>Material and methods</p> <p>Revised as suggested. The study area map is also presented in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>On the background</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>Revised as suggested and highlight the manuscript.</p> <p>Material and methods</p> <p>Revised as suggested and highlight in the manuscript.</p> <p>Results and discussion</p> <p>The word limit for the article will rise to > 12,000 words if all tables and figures are included in the submission.</p> <p>If suggested, a second supplemental file can be attached.</p> <p>The images (photos) presented have been revised as</p>

Review Form 1.7

	<p>specify the source of each image. They must specify the exact name of what they illustrate. Is it the leaf, flower, roots, bark, stem of the plant that they present to readers? Indeed, the reader sees around each image presented here by the authors, several other elements. Hence, the question what exactly do the authors want to present to readers?</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In science, the conclusion is made in relation to the objectives, hypothesis or research question. Possibly, perspectives can be associated with it.</p>	<p>suggested.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Revised as suggested and highlight in the manuscript.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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