



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_7084
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impacts of Natural Disasters on Smallholder Agriculture in Rural Cameroon
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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Manuscript plan is well organized and well structured. Results are interesting, reading and understanding the whole text are easy. My recommendation is accept after major revision for consideration for possible publication in American Journal of Experimental Agriculture. The major comments below: Kindly, provide the abstract with more scientific results (measurable value) instead of “The results reveal that the disaster <u>had a very serious impact on livestock and human</u>”. The article language is good enough. However, there are few mistakes as example : Page 4 Line 120: write “Moreover,” instead of “Not surprising therefore that” Page 5 Line 147: Delete “Not surprising therefore that” and write “The” instead of “the”. Page 5Line 169: Delete “below” In tables 1, 2 and 3, write “before disaster” instead	These comments have been addressed and are highlighted in yellow as required in the revised manuscript, re-submitted with these comments.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of “One day before the disaster (1986)” and change it in all tables Write “after disaster” instead of “One day after the disaster (1986)” and change it in all tables. Write “currently” instead of “At the time of the survey (2010)” Line 241: write “Scientific evidence revealed that the globe is witnessing overwhelming climate change.” Instead of “Scientific evidence that the globe is witnessing climate change is overwhelming.” There are a serious statistical problem in tables 1, 2 and 3. All Std. Deviation values are higher than the Mean values. This is totally wrong. It is impossible to have Std. Deviation value higher than the Mean value. Kindly, recheck data entering and data analysis again.	All comments revised as suggested Line 241: write “Scientific evidence revealed that the globe is witnessing overwhelming climate change.” Instead of “Scientific evidence that the globe is witnessing climate change is overwhelming.” This was not changed, because it would have changed the meaning behind the sentence. We ran the statistics again for some of the variables and the results are the same. While it is not often that the standard deviation is higher than the mean, it is possible when the data is skewed. In the research area for instance there can be a very high variance in livestock holdings when one compares a crop farming household (e.g. owning one cattle) with a livestock bororo household (owning 300 heads) in the same village. The means are averages, and the standard deviation in our opinion show that there are large variances amongst individual households. More explanations in this light can be read (sorry in German only) from:
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	After correction the data analysis, it will be better to convert tables 1, 2, and 3 to figures form (column chart) and fixed the Std. Deviation on the top of each column.	http://www.statistik-forum.de/mittelwert-standardabweichung-f6/fehlerhafte-standardabweichung-t1870.html http://www.google.de/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CC8QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.matheplanet.com%2Fmatheplanet%2Fnuke%2Fhtml%2Fviewtopic.php%3Ftopic%3D23801&ei=U59aUqXoMYXJtAbNwYD4Bw&usg=AFQjCNExftrpIQKnRVyFJAe09kivHQgyA&bvm=bv.53899372,d.Yms&cad=rja http://www.matheplanet.com/default3.html?call=viewtopic.php?topic=23801&ref=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.de%2Furl%3Fsa%3Dt%26rct%3Dj%26q%3D%26esrc%3Ds%26source%3Dweb%26cd%3D1%26ved%3D0CC8QFjAA We have therefore made explanations under the tables to clarify the rather ‘unusual’ findings. Converting tables 1, 2 and 3 into figures was found to be very difficult, as each of this table is a composite report on a number of variables. It would therefore have required more than one figure per table. We therefore opted to keep the information in tabular form. However, tables 4 and 5 were converted into figures 1 and 2 respectively. Standard deviations and P values have been indicated as suggested by the reviewer.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		