



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry</b>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_AJRAF_50478</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>EVALUATING EFFICIENCY OF SAMPLING SCHEMES IN TROPICAL NATURAL FORESTS: REVIEW AND SIMULATION EXPERIENCE FROM KENYA</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>  |

**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>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|                                     | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replace words that are already in the title. The article does not evaluate software R, so substitute as well.</li> <li>- Begin the introduction by addressing the theory of study. Objectives, assumptions and hypotheses should be removed by the end of the introduction, after placing the reader on the topic and importance of the study.</li> <li>- Describe existing sampling methods and protocols, positives and negatives. Characterize in the introduction.</li> <li>- Methodological aspects should be removed from the introduction to the material and methods section</li> <li>- Add geographic coordinates of each area</li> <li>- Describe the environmental attributes measured. Has any forest attribute been assessed? Richness, abundance, spatial distribution? Inform and detail.</li> <li>- Are the areas private or governmental? This must be informed and the authorizations for the research must be presented. As scientists we can not invade any space, public or private, to conduct our studies.</li> <li>- Was any material collected for identification? where was the identification made? in some laboratory? in some research institution? To describe</li> <li>- The study does not clearly indicate which indicators were used. More important than talking about design and software, it is important to address environmental and ecological indicators and how they respond to the model</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agreed and effected. Replaced words that are already in the title. Key words revised accordingly and software R removed.<br/>NB. Revised abstract for enhanced focus</li> <li>- Agreed and effected. Introduction revised accordingly. Text reorganized: started with the theory of study. Objectives, assumptions and hypotheses put at the end of the introduction.</li> <li>- Agreed and effected. Described existing sampling methods and protocols, positives and negatives. Characterization is in the introduction.</li> <li>- Agreed and effected. Material and methods section revised e.g. Data analysis subsection is created (2.4).</li> <li>- Agreed and effected. Added geographic coordinates of each area (2.1).</li> <li>- Explained. Assessed forest variables and derived attributes are in Section 2.3. Environmental attributes include slope, gaps, light screening. Attributes assessed are indicated. See Fig.5 caption and section 2.3. Data analysis section (2.4) paragraph 1. Results on biophysical characterization of reference forest populations (section 3.1.1 and Table 3). Richness and abundance data are indicated. No spatial distribution was assessed.</li> </ul> |



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                                  |  |   |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
|                                  | <p>being tested. More importance was given to the method than to the object studied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Less than 25% of references are from the last five years. Update.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are the areas private or governmental? Field data were collected from Kakamega and Mt Elgon forests are gazetted state forests under a bigger research project funded by AFORNET (African Forest Research Network). Permission was sought from Kenya Forest Service Offices in Kakamega, Isecheno Station, Mt Elgon Kaberwa Forest Station. Loruk woodland is communal resource in the wider Baringo Woodland. Kenya Forestry Research Institute operates in the area and was consulted for guidance. Authority was sought from Local Government leaders. The study project was not private, it was under a public University (Moi University, Chepkoilel Campus, now known as University of Eldoret).</li> <li>- No material collected for identification. Trees were identified standing. Local names from local guides and parataxonomists were recorded and checklists from past studies used to translate to scientific names where applicable (Section 2.3). No laboratory work nor taking any specimen to research institution.</li> <li>- Conclusion revised to reflect indicators used. Environmental and ecological indicators and how they respond to the model being tested are undressed.</li> <li>- Less than 25% of references are from the last five years. Agreed. However, references used relate well to the object studied and reflect current knowledge of the same. Three new references were added but still not within last 5 years.</li> <li>- General editing was done as guided and as deemed necessary for more clarity and enhanced paper quality e.g. tables captions and content, graphs external borders, consolidating data analysis section in materials and methods, reformatting citations and list of references, reformatted Figure 4, Table 6, etc</li> </ul> |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments   | See comments   | See comments  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments |  |   |

**PART 2:**

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |