



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRAF_48853 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Quantitative & Qualitative Perspectives of Forest-Water Interactions at Catchment Scales |
| Type of the Article | Policy Article |

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

| | 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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>Good policy article that could be considered for publication by AJRAF. However some shortcomings need to be fully addressed before the paper can be considered for publication.</p> <p>An analytical approach should be used in discussing the ideas that run through the paper. It doesn't just suffice to describe the basic ideas of the study. Plausible justifications should be given and backed by the research works of other authors. Considering that it is a policy/review paper, it is of the essence to adopt a comparative approach when discussing ideas i.e. compare and contrast the findings of different authors with respect to the subject matter of the study.</p> <p>Equally, more relevant research works (especially the most recent i.e. 2014 – 2019) should be used when discussing the main ideas that run through the paper. Considering that it is a policy/review study, it is imperative to seek for and cite the research works of various authors in order to give the paper more weight.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authors would like to enthusiastically thanks the reviewer for quoting good and encouraging words by citing the manuscript as a good policy article and its suitability for publication in AJRAF. As suggested,some of the constituents in regards to analytical approach and plausible justifications are added upon in the revised version of manuscript. Realising the importance of this big suggestion all together a new sub-section/para is embedded in the manuscript by setting the platform for a wider and deeper comparison and offering contrast of findings of past researchers Strengthening by adding extra relevant researches is attained by incorporating about 22 new and most recent references and their grey stuff. As evident from new version of manuscript about 40 research works are encompassed therein where more than 100 researchers/authors are involved. Language and syntax has been looked back many times and hope that the manuscript in its revised form looks to be a n entirely new version meeting expectation of reviewer/s. Yes, I agree and thanks for raising the point of using symbol '&' as much as about 80 locations, which has been now totally eliminated and kept only for words like R&D <p>As suggested the no. of research work references has been raised from 18 to 40 with the hope that it satisfies the goal set by reviewers and certainly enhanced the look of policy paper on a emerging issue.</p> |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>Language and syntax used in the paper should be looked into once more.</p> <p>It is imperative for the symbol "&" to be written in full i.e. "and". This should be rectified across the entire study.</p> <p>Number of research works referenced in the study too small (just 18). More research works should be sought for and referenced.</p> | |
| Optional/General comments | Good policy paper that could be considered for publication by AJRAF. However, the aforementioned points should be integrated in the work before the paper is considered for publication. | |

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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |