

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_121875</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Factors Promoting and Impeding Diversification of Forestry Resource-Based Livelihoods in the Leh Himalaya</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses a critical gap in current research, providing new insights that could influence future studies and applications. Its rigorous methodology and comprehensive data analysis enhance its credibility, making it a valuable resource for researchers in the field. Personally, I appreciate the manuscript for its clarity and depth, as it effectively communicates complex concepts in an accessible manner. However, I would suggest improvements in the discussion section to better contextualize the findings within existing literature, which could strengthen its impact further.	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mention the specific study area (Leh Himalaya of Ladakh Union Territory) in the first sentence to provide more context.</li> <li>• Include a brief description of the sampling technique used to select the 185 respondents and 9 sample villages.</li> <li>• Highlight the most significant promoting and impeding factors identified in the study to emphasize the key findings</li> </ul>	
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.	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound for the following reasons:</p> <p><b>Rigorous Methodology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The study employed a multi-stage random sampling technique to select 185 respondents from 9 sample villages across 5 blocks in the Leh district of Ladakh Union Territory. This systematic approach ensures that the sample is representative of the population, enhancing the reliability and validity of the findings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comprehensive Data Collection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The researchers utilized both qualitative and quantitative methods for data collection, including structured interviews with respondents and non-participant observations. This mixed-methods approach provides a more holistic understanding of the factors promoting and impeding the diversification of forestry resource-based livelihoods in the region.</li> </ul> <p><b>Robust Data Analysis</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The study employed descriptive statistics, such as frequency, percentage, average, and the simple ranking technique, to analyze the data. The weighted mean score (WMS) and percentage score (PS) were calculated for each promoting and impeding factor, allowing for a clear ranking and comparison of their effectiveness and contributory impacts on livelihood diversification.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alignment with Existing Literature</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The findings of the manuscript are supported by previous studies in the field, demonstrating that the results are consistent with and build upon existing knowledge. This alignment strengthens the scientific credibility of the research.</li> </ul>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Manoj Kumar Das</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sri Sri University, India</b>