

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_127725
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Typology of agroforestry models in the <i>Anacardium occidentale</i> L. (Anacardiaceae) parks of the FARE project: case of the southern and western peripheral zones of the Benoué National Park, Northern Region, Cameroon</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>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Manuscript if written fairly but to make it good one major revision is needed. Author states that <i>Anacardium occidentale</i> based agro forestry systems are practiced but don't have mention of traditional agro forestry systems which existed and how the new system is different what are added advantages. This paper seems more like documentation of <i>Anacardium occidentale</i> based agro forestry models without providing much insight or statistical support with authors claim of improved livelihood.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Could be improved	
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.	Discussion needs to be added more explaining how much increase in livelihood or income generation increase is seen need to be recorded in result part also.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Fair enough	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rashmi Ramesh Shanbhag
Department, University & Country	Institute of Wood Science and Technology, India