

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJRAF_117896
Title of the Manuscript:	An Overview of Trees in Smallholder Farmers' Agricultural Landscapes: A Case Study from Sub-Saharan Africa
Type of the 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>To some extent.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Whether "trees" can be replaced with "agro-forestry"??</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract is not concrete. The reviewer is unable to comprehend the approach and methods followed in the manuscript. This manuscript is not dealing with Zero hunger and nutritional security as indicated in the abstract.</b></p> <p>4. <b>A clear indication of methodology is necessary for the understanding of the study.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>7. <b>Yes</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>A conceptual framework should be given for the study including methodology. The bibliometric visualization method should be explained briefly.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Soumya Mohapatra</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>ICAR-Central Institute of Post-Harvest Engineering and Technology, Ludhiana, India</b>