



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_47525
Title of the Manuscript:	SUSTAINABILITY, POPULATION AND STRUCTURE OF WOODY SPECIES COMPOSITION OF TARABA STATE FORESTS
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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>The methodology does not mention the measurement of plant height, variable critical to determine the structural analysis of vegetation.</p> <p>Lines 83-85: Specify the variables subject to two - way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using SPSS.</p> <p>Comparison of Species Composition and Structure</p> <p>The text mention that the Analysis of variance (ANOVA) Indicated That result is no significant difference there Among the protected areas. Similarly, the ANOVA revealed That the woody species composition and structure Among the ecological zones of the study area is not Significantly different ; however, these results are not properly backed up with statistical information; since it is difficult to understand that from the point of view of structural analysis of non-existence differences between protected ecological zones and areas with disturbances.</p> <p>The text does not present the information about sustainability as indicated in the summary and keywords.</p> <p>4. DISCUSSION</p> <p>In the discussion the autor reports a large number of authors where supposedly compare the results with the results of other authors, however, much of the discussion relate to the review of literatures.</p> <p>In summary, the present research is original (and properly structured) is relevant from the point of view of the development of the management plan vegetation. To do this, it is recommended to properly specify all statistical analyzes carried out by the SPSS program.</p>	<p>Plant height was not considered because both height and diameter give the same result. The diameter classes were the major creteria that determined forest structure</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>The statement mean that there are no significant differences among the protected areas and the Ecological zones.</p> <p>The presence of some woody stands having branches at breast height showed poor management techniques which does no bring about sustainable development at the middle diameter classes.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>Lines 13-16: Add the names of authors of species.</p> <p>Add the outstanding information on woody species dominance, important value index and population structure.</p> <p>It is suggested to change the title of the manuscript to "SUSTAINABILITY, POPULATION AND STRUCTURE OF WOODY SPECIES COMPOSITION TARABA STATE FOREST".</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS</p> <p>2.1 Study Area</p> <p>Line 43: Change "Taraba State lies ..." to "Taraba State in Nigeria lies ...".</p> <p>Add latitudes of the study area.</p> <p>2.2 D ata Collection and Analysis</p> <p>Line 59: change "developed by [13] for tropical ecosystems" to "developed by Keller, [13] for tropical ecosystems"</p> <p>Line 80: Change "as it was used by [3]" to "as it was used by Neelo, [3]".</p>	<p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Corrected
		Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> 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> No	