

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_121873</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Socioeconomic Determinants of Livelihood Dependence on Forestry Resources in Leh Himalaya, India</b>
Type of the Article	

#### 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>

#### 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>
<b>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.</b>	Importance of the Manuscript for the Scientific Community  This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the critical issue of livelihood dependence on forestry resources in the arid and cold desert region of Leh Himalaya, India. By identifying and analyzing various socioeconomic determinants, the study provides valuable insights that can aid in formulating effective forestry interventions and policies aimed at poverty alleviation and sustainable development in similar regions. The detailed statistical analysis and comprehensive data collection methods enhance the reliability and applicability of the findings.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Personal Evaluation of the Manuscript  I find this manuscript to be well-researched and thorough in its approach to understanding the socioeconomic factors influencing forestry-based livelihoods. The use of both descriptive and analytical statistics to analyze the data lends robustness to the study's conclusions. However, the manuscript could benefit from a clearer presentation of the results to enhance readability and comprehension.	
<b>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.</b>	Evaluation of the Title  The title "Socioeconomic Determinants of Livelihood Dependence on Forestry Resources in Leh Himalaya India" is suitable as it accurately reflects the core focus of the study.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Abstract Evaluation  The abstract is comprehensive, covering the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. However, it could be improved by including a brief mention of the practical applications of the research findings and any potential recommendations for policy or practice.	
<b>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.</b>	Subsections and Structure	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>		

**Review Form 3**

	<p>The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate and logically organized. Each section flows well into the next, providing a clear and coherent narrative.</p> <p>Scientific Correctness and Robustness</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The use of a multi-stage random sampling technique, along with detailed statistical analyses, ensures the validity and reliability of the findings. The high coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) and statistically significant F value further confirm the robustness of the results.</p> <p>References</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent, providing a solid foundation for the research. However, including more recent studies on similar topics from different geographical locations could enhance the literature review and provide a broader context for the findings.</p> <p>Language and English Quality</p> <p>The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. However, minor grammatical adjustments and refinements in sentence structure could improve clarity and readability.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Abstract: Include practical applications and recommendations.</li> <li>- Results Presentation: Enhance clarity and readability.</li> <li>- References: Incorporate more recent studies for a broader context.</li> <li>- Language: Minor grammatical adjustments for improved clarity.</li> </ul>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Petros Chavula</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Zambia, Zambia</b></p>