



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJHR_44580
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Analyses of Non-Timber Forest Products Utilization among Communities around Kwabaktina Forest Reserve, Adamawa State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>Line10: It should be "utilized" NOT 'utilize'</p> <p>Line 12: Should be "significance" NOT 'significant'</p> <p>Line 17: There should be a full stop after "...the people". Then start a new sentence with "To ensure speedy growth and yielding..."</p> <p>Lines19-20: Should read "Also, the people of the communities should be encouraged..." NOT 'Also, the people of the communities should also be encourage...'</p> <p>Lines25-27: The author(s) should recast the sentence. It is not clear.</p> <p>Line54: should be "temperature" NOT 'temperatures'</p> <p>Line 61:The author(s) should give reason(s) for the purposive selection</p> <p>Lines62-64: Please check your sentence and correct it. You cannot administer 60 copies of questionnaire to every respondent in each community. Rather you can only administer a copy of questionnaire each to 60 respondents in each community. By your statement, you mean each respondent will have 60 copies of questionnaire. So check and effect the correction.</p> <p>Line65: Please remove "and" after 'interview'</p> <p>Line67: Should be "utilized" NOT 'utilize'</p> <p>Lines 82-88: The Logistic Regression stated here should be removed. There is no part of the article where it has been used for analysis. In other words, nowhere in this article where factors influencing the utilization of NTFPs were analysed. So the Logistic Regression expression should be removed. Even the interpretation of the variables in the expression is ambiguous and unclear.</p> <p>Line 98: Remove "was"</p> <p>Line100: "43%" should be in parenthesis</p> <p>Lines103-105: Check your sentences properly. Are you saying the primary occupation is "assess"? How did you mean?</p> <p>Line106: Should be N10,000 NOT N10,00</p> <p>Line117: Should be "NTFP" NOT 'NTFPs', since the author(s) is referring to only honey here as an NTFP.</p> <p>Line166: "respectively" should be after 'Giginya'</p> <p>Line235: It should be "encouraged" NOT 'encourage'</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Awe, Femi
Department, University & Country	Forestry Research Institute of Nigeria, Nigeria.