

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_120257
Title of the Manuscript:	Agroforestry Practices as a Keystone for Biodiversity Conservation: A review
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Here is a critical review of the manuscript:</p> <p>This manuscript provides a comprehensive review of agroforestry practices and their role in biodiversity conservation, making it an important contribution to the scientific literature on sustainable agriculture and ecosystem management. The extensive coverage of different agroforestry systems, their ecological benefits, and challenges to implementation offers valuable insights for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners in the fields of agroforestry, conservation biology, and sustainable development.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title:</p> <p>The title "Agroforestry Practices as a Keystone for Biodiversity Conservation: A review" is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. It effectively conveys the main focus on agroforestry and its importance for biodiversity conservation.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Abstract:</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive and provides a good overview of the manuscript's content. It covers the key points, including the definition of agroforestry, its ecological benefits, challenges to implementation, and future prospects. However, it could be improved by:</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>1. Adding a brief mention of specific agroforestry practices discussed in the review (e.g., agrisilviculture, silvopastoral systems).</p> <p>2. Including a sentence on the methodology used for the review (e.g., literature search criteria, time frame).</p> <p>3. Providing 1-2 concrete examples of successful agroforestry implementations to illustrate its potential.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Structure and Subsections:</p> <p>The manuscript's structure is appropriate and logical, covering historical perspectives, types of agroforestry practices, biodiversity conservation aspects, case studies, challenges, and future prospects. The subsections are well-organized and provide a clear flow of information.</p> <p>Scientific Correctness:</p> <p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound. It draws on a wide range of peer-reviewed literature and provides detailed explanations of agroforestry concepts and their ecological impacts. The inclusion of case studies and examples from various regions strengthens the scientific validity of the arguments presented.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>The review demonstrates scientific rigor by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing clear definitions and explanations of agroforestry practices. 2. Discussing both benefits and challenges of agroforestry implementation. 3. Incorporating diverse perspectives on agroforestry's role in biodiversity conservation. 4. Addressing current knowledge gaps and future research needs. <p>References:</p> <p>The manuscript includes a substantial number of references (60), which appear to be sufficient and recent. Many citations are from the last decade, indicating that the review incorporates current research. However, the review could benefit from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Including more recent studies (2020-2024) on emerging agroforestry innovations and their impacts on biodiversity. 2. Adding references to meta-analyses or systematic reviews on agroforestry's ecological effects. 3. Incorporating more international policy documents related to agroforestry and biodiversity 	

Review Form 3

-	conservation.	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language Quality: The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear and coherent, with appropriate use of scientific terminology. However, some minor improvements could be made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proofreading for occasional grammatical errors and typos. 2. Ensuring consistency in formatting of scientific names (italicization). 3. Reducing some repetitive phrases and improving sentence variety in certain sections. <p>Overall, this manuscript provides a valuable contribution to the scientific literature on agroforestry and biodiversity conservation, offering a comprehensive review that will be useful for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners in related fields.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Petros Chavula
Department, University & Country	University of Zambia, Zambia