



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_46794
Title of the Manuscript:	Community Poultry Project for conserving the wildlife species in Magombera Forest, Tanzania
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>The manuscript "<i>Community Poultry Project for conserving the wildlife species in Magombera Forest, Tanzania</i>" focuses on the results of a project aimed to enhance the conservation of the Iringa Red Colobus monkey and other wildlife species in Magombera Forest (Tanzania). The manuscript is structured as a technical report (not as a scientific article) and the results are interesting only a local level.</p> <p>The study area and the method used in the survey are not well-described in the "Material and method" section. Therefore, it is impossible to understand the quality of the data provided by the project. In addition, the results are not very interesting in the way they are presented by the authors. The relationship between poultry production and wildlife species conservation is investigated superficially.</p> <p>The manuscript has too many weaknesses to be published in a scientific journal.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 1: in the first part of the "Introduction" the authors described the specific situation in Magombera forest without any description of biodiversity conservation topic in Africa or in Tanzania. In order to improve the "Introduction" it is important to consider the following aspects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Could you add a description of the "nature or biodiversity conservation" topic at international level (describing the most important political documents) and in Africa (with special regard in Tanzania); o Iringa Red Colobus monkey is endemic in which geographical context? Add more information about the diffusion of this species in Tanzania and the relationships between these wildlife species and poultry production. - Page 2: the aim of the manuscript is not well-described regarding the relationship between poultry production and wildlife species conservation. <p>Material and method</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 2: Where is located Magombera forest? In which part of Tanzania are located the Magombera forest? Add a map of Tanzania highlighting the Magombera forest. - Page 2: Change from "This study tyook place in Magombera forest..." to "The study area is the Magombera forest located in...". Add geographical coordinates of Magomber forest. - Page 2: in order to clarify the situation in the study area, the authors should add the following information: (1) distribution of main land uses (% of forest on total land area, % of agricultural crops on total land area, and so on); (2) local population (inhabitants or number of villages closed to the Magombera forest); (3) diffusion in hectares (and farmers involved) of different agricultural activities; (4) main forest types in Magombera forest; (5) relationship between forest types and wildlife species mentioned in the first part of the "Introduction". - Page 3: the description of the questionnaire is very weak. Could you describe the questionnaires in more detail? How many questions (divided in open-ended and closed-ended questions) did the questionnaire consist of?? Did you have divided the questionnaire in thematic section? Did you pre-tested the questionnaire (if yes, did you pre-tested the questionnaire with how many people??) - Page 3: the description of the sampling method used is absent. Could you describe the sampling method used in the survey? Are 119 respondents statistically representative of the total population of Katurukila village? - Page 3: Why did you have used the Friedman Test Statistic (Q)? Did you have considered other statistical tests? 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Results and discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 4: change from “1.1. Results” to “3.1. Community poultry keeping benefits” - Page 4: in my opinion, it would be important to add some information about the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents (age, gender, level of education, etc..). Could you test the statistical differences considering the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents? - Page 5: change the title of paragraph in “Impact of training on the poultry production to local community” and number from “1.1.3” to “3.1.3.” - Page 5: I don’t understand if 96.15% is referred to 52 or 119 individuals. - Page 5: Could you summarize the results of “Impact of training on the poultry production to local community” in a table? - Page 5: Add some comments about the results of the Statistical Friedman test. - Page 5: change from “1.2. Discussion” to “4. Discussion”. - Pages 5-6: the “Discussion” is not related to the results of the study. It would be advisable to strengthen the “Discussion” section with more comments about the relationship between poultry production and wildlife species conservation (e.g., Iringa Red Colobus monkey) and comparing the data with other studies in Eastern Africa. <p>Figures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 3: Change the Figure 1 with a more descriptive image (highlighting the Magomberera forest in Tanzania). <p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With regard to the reference “Duffy R., & John A.V.S. (2013), What are the title, editor name and country of the report? In addition, Duffy and John are the name of the authors not the surname. - Check the formatting of all references. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alessandro Paletto
Department, University & Country	Council for Agricultural Research and Economics (CREA), Italy