

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_112247
Title of the Manuscript:	A Growing Prosperity of Okra Cultivation (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> L.) under Mahaneem (<i>Ailanthus excelsa</i>) based Agro-Silviculture System in a Semi-Arid Region of India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes the manuscript is important for the scientific community. The title suggests a specific study focusing on the cultivation of okra (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> L.) under a Mahaneem (<i>Ailanthus excelsa</i>) based agro-silviculture system in a semi-arid region of India. However, the importance of this study to the scientific community depends on farmer's level of adopting this agroforestry system and its successful results.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the title is good. . Here are some suggestions for the title "Innovative Approaches to Okra Farming: A Mahaneem (<i>Ailanthus excelsa</i>) Agro-Silviculture Perspective in Semi-Arid India" can also be recommended.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes. The abstract of the article is comprehensive enough. But addition of one or two points relevant to research gap will enhance the article in a scientific manner.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Overall, that each section is well-organized, with a clear connection between different elements of the manuscript. However, Author doesn't provide sufficient data related to NPV and IRR to support the findings and conclusions in each part.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes, the methodology adopted in the system is scientifically acceptable. But the statistical tool needs to be addressed and graphical parts need to be inserted.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes the references in the manuscript are proper and recent enough. But, the author need to incorporate more references related to the present study in order to correlate with other similar scientific studies.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. But, there is some minor grammatical mistakes in the article. For eg: In introduction part 'conditions in arid region of India is' need to be changed to 'conditions in arid region of India are'.	
Optional/General comments	The article is good but there are some missing parts like mentioning statistical tool, graphical representation will enhance the article in a holistic manner.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	S. Navaneetha Krishnan
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India