



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_50158
Title of the Manuscript:	CONSERVATION EDUCATION, ALTERNATIVE LIVELIHOOD AND HABITAT RESTORATION: BEST STRATEGIES FOR CONSERVATION OF MAGOMBERA FOREST RESERVE
Type of the 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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This is an interesting research dealing with social constraints to forest conservation, and how to improve both their knowledge and their involvement on it. Next, I am exposing the main concerns about it, in order to improve it.</p> <p>Introduction section is pretty fine, although the last paragraph is somewhat repetitive in certain aspects, like in the potential of bee keeping. Also, I think that you should explain a little more about the deforestation threaten and the habitat restoration need in the Magombera forest reserve.</p> <p>Material and Methods. The study area needs a little more of information in order to let the readers understand the context. For example, "vegetation cover is composed of natural trees herbs and grasses" is highly vague. Please provide the ecosystem type, some of the more representative plant species the something about climate (for example, mean temperatures or relative humidity). And a location map or the coordinates of the reserve would be highly appreciated.</p> <p>It is unclear how you selected the seventy-five participants for the survey. And it would be so much better to have the survey as supplementary material, so readers can know which questions did you ask.</p> <p>Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 should be merged.</p> <p>Section 2.2.4 looks odd. It does not fit the overall context of the manuscript. It looks like a completely different study, where deforestation is determined, and an ecological restoration project is proposed and implemented. Please, explain it a little more. And it is unclear the relationship with the restoration and the bee keeping in this section: "helped to determine the potential of the forest for bee keeping". When did you determine that potential? It is explained nowhere.</p> <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>In the first paragraph you mention the Likert scaling, but it was not explained in Material and Methods section, nor the statistical analyses. Please include all the data analyses in the M&amp;M section, and indicate which are the variables you are testing. According to the Fig. 3, it looks that there was a survey before the training, and the same one was applied after it. It was not said in the M&amp;M section. All the questions were asked also after the training or only some of them? Please, explain this in the M&amp;M.</p> <p>What do you mean with "modern bee keeping"? (line 121)</p> <p>You are saying that 89% of planted trees survived. After how long? This is neither explained in the M&amp;M section.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>Please, revise the instructions for authors section in the journal website in order to check if discussion should be together with the results, since in line 100 you wrote "Results and Discussion".</p> <p>Lines 144-145. But in line 111 you said "their attitude towards conservation of the forest was negative". So, your results do agree the assumptions from [13], right? In discussion, the knowledge on bee keeping seems to be very important, but it does not seem so after M&amp;M and results sections. If authors consider this is one of the main points of the research, it should be reflected in those two sections, and even in the introduction.</p> <p>The 4.3 section confirms what I said before about restoration initiative being an odd section. The whole manuscript deals with people involvement, and how rural communities are related to the forest conservation. However, in the restoration-related sections, it looks like an ecological research, where things like ecological reasons for the limitations of seedlings establishment are discussed.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>Although, in general, English is good and the text is understandable, a grammar revision would be nice, since there are some misspelling. Here I point out some of them:                  Lines 44-47: In three lines you are saying "forest" six times! Please revise it.                  Line 68: "were used"                  Line 69: "questions were formulated"                  Line 80: "were used"                  Line 88: "fliers were prepared"                  Line 95: "we counted [...] Four transects were set"                  Line 120: "Seventy-five community members participated in the bee keeping project". And you have said it already, about four more times. Try to avoid to repeat the same information.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Marina Mazón</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Nacional de Loja, Ecuador</b>