

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_115534
Title of the Manuscript:	Trade-offs between farm incomes and soil loss: An application of bio-economic modelling in a semi-arid watershed in south India.
Type of the Article	Journal Article

## Review Form 1.7

### **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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p><b>OTHER COMMENTS:</b></p> <p>1. Authors should provide details on the sampling method used for the study as well as the sample calculation. This is important to justify the validity &amp; reliability of results.</p> <p>2. Authors did provide a comprehensive analysis of results; however, no discussions were provided. Discussion of study outcome is an important part of any research and should be included in this article.</p>	<p>Thank you sir, for the constructive comments and suggestions.</p> <p>The primary data was collected form the padmaram watershed. The watershed was purposively selected for the study as it included area with and without intervention. The stratified random sampling was done for the farmers based on elevation. (details are being added in the write up). Data was collected for the treated and untreated areas separately.</p> <p>The discussion part has been improved in the edited write up.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<p>YES</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The paper is generally very well written, quality of data is very good, and citations are well up to date. With some improvement as per the above comments, this paper should be ready for publication.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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)	No