Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Review in Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRRA_1766**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Socio-Economic Factors Affecting NTFPs Income in Gujarat: A Study of the Dangs Range**
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(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.	This manuscript demonstrates the importance of NTFPs for livelihoods, offering income and employment while supporting forest conservation. I appreciate the use of regression analysis to clarify economic challenges, though further exploration of non-significant variables like education would enhance understanding.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Yes,** the title of the article is suitable. It accurately reflects the study's focus on analysing how various socio-economic factors influence income from non-timber forest products (NTFPs) among tribal communities in the Dangs Range of Gujarat. The topic is clear, specific, and relevant to the content, providing readers with a direct understanding of the study's scope and regional context.	
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.	The abstract is mostly comprehensive but could be enhanced for clarity and conciseness. Here are some suggestions: i. Introduce NTFPs and their significance, especially for readers unfamiliar with the term. You could mention their ecological or economic significance to contextualize why they are essential to tribal communities. ii. Clarify research methodology. It would be helpful to mention how date were collected (e.g., "via structured interviews" or "surveys") iii. Summarize key findings in a sentence or two specifically the negative relationship between the number of collectors and income, and mention its implications. **iv.** Avoid unnecessary detail on sample selection specifics (e.g., specifying the exact number of villages or respondents unless crucial). Instead, state something like "A sample of 60 respondents was studied across two randomly selected talukas". Also, condense statistical details (e.g., average collection amounts, income amounts) into fewer words to make room for broader insights.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure and subsections of the manuscript are generally well-organized and appropriate for this type of the study. Each section logically follows the previous one, making it easy to follow the research objectives, methodology, and findings.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically sound due to its clear methodology and use of a multiple regression model to assess the impact of the socio-economic factors on NTFP income. The representative sample and structured data collection enhance the reliability of the findings, which are presented with thorough statistical analysis. This approach effectively supports the conclusions on NTFPs' role in income and employment for tribal communities in Gujarat.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	It is will good if there are additional reference	

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The article demonstrates a good level of technical detail and organization for scholarly communication, but it could benefit from improvements in grammar, phrasing, and overall readability to meet higher standards for academic writing.	
Optional/General comments		

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Opeyemi Michael Boboye**
Department, University & Country	**Federal University of Technology, Nigeria**