

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_121686</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative performance of traditional and improved integrated farming systems in the hills of Jammu &amp; Kashmir</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research article</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article lies in its comprehensive analysis of Integrated Farming Systems (IFS) as a viable solution for enhancing agricultural productivity and profitability in the context of climate change and market risks, particularly in the challenging terrains of the Kashmir valley in the North Western Himalayas. The study provides valuable insights by comparing the performance of traditional, improved, and conventional mono-cropping systems across different altitudinal ecologies, demonstrating that improved IFS models, especially those horticulture-based, significantly outperform conventional practices in terms of yield, profitability, and System Economic Efficiency (SEE).	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What was the economic status in 2017 and in 2022? Since you have mentioned 'comparative performance' in the title, is it only comparing the different altitudes? If so, what is the relevance of mentioning the year 2017? Please clarify the rationale for assessing performance after five years.</li> <li>2. Please clarify what is meant by "low plains," "mid-altitude," and "high altitude" in a footnote.</li> <li>3. You mentioned that a total of eighteen farming families were selected—six each for conventional, traditional agriculture/horticulture-based IFS, and improved agriculture/horticulture-based IFS—from across three agro-ecologies: lower plains, mid-belt, and high altitudes in the materials and methods section. However, there are six different cropping systems in Table 1. Does this mean only three families/households per cropping system?</li> <li>4. If there were three families/households per cropping system, then that would imply one family per altitude. Is it possible to generalize the data with only one family per altitude?</li> <li>5. You have provided net returns in Tables 2, 3, and 4. Please include the cost of cultivation for each crop in the appendix.</li> <li>6. Please explain the important numerical data presented in Tables 2, 3, and 4.</li> <li>7. In Figures 1 to 6, the amounts are mentioned in Rupees, which results in many zeroes. Please express the amounts in thousands to improve readability.</li> </ol>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Please add some more references.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, its good.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Please address the corrections marked in red in the script.	

### **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>Ramu, M. S.</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore, India</b>