



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_50478
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATING EFFICIENCY OF SAMPLING SCHEMES IN TROPICAL NATURAL FORESTS: REVIEW AND SIMULATION EXPERIENCE FROM KENYA
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>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replace words that are already in the title. The article does not evaluate software R, so substitute as well. - 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. - Describe existing sampling methods and protocols, positives and negatives. Characterize in the introduction. - Methodological aspects should be removed from the introduction to the material and methods section - Add geographic coordinates of each area - Describe the environmental attributes measured. Has any forest attribute been assessed? Richness, abundance, spatial distribution? Inform and detail. - 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. - Was any material collected for identification? where was the identification made? in some laboratory? in some research institution? To describe - 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 being tested. More importance was given to the method than to the object studied. - Less than 25% of references are from the last five years. Update. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replace words that are already in the title. The article does not evaluate software R, so substitute as well. - 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. - Describe existing sampling methods and protocols, positives and negatives. Characterize in the introduction. - Methodological aspects should be removed from the introduction to the material and methods section - Add geographic coordinates of each area - Describe the environmental attributes measured. Has any forest attribute been assessed? Richness, abundance, spatial distribution? Inform and detail. - 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. - Was any material collected for identification? where was the identification made? in some laboratory? in some research institution? To describe - 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 being tested. More importance was given to the method than to the object studied. - Less than 25% of references are from the last five years. Update.
Minor REVISION comments	See comments	See comments



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
---------------------------	--	--

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Junir Antonio Lutinski
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de Santa Maria – UFSM, Brazil