



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAERI_12159
Title of the Manuscript:	An analysis of socio-economic and farm forestry enterprises in selected arid and semi-arid areas (ASALs) of forest zones of Kenya
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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This is most likely a report, not a scientific paper. The manuscript is too long, more descriptive. The references are not strong, mostly reports. Some references listed in the text are not mentioned in the references section (Mariara 2009, World bank 2002, Arnold 2001, Sunderlin et al. 2005, ...). Background: too long, and not well structures in terms of ideas. Results from tables are regularly repeated in the text. The comment of table 3 presented in lines 173 – 175 is not corrected. Figures are not clear. No title is mentioned below the figures Table 7 is not clear: we see a mixture of plant species (avocado, papaw, mango) and products (charcoal, honey, poles, timber) on the same line	• We have reworked the document to capture all the comments raised by the reviewer • The background/introduction (page 1-2, line 40-118) now has a clear focus on the idea of farm forestry in improving rural livelihoods, the reason for the study in Kenya and the study areas and has been strengthened by additional of references. • All references apperaing in the text has been included in the reference section and formated to meet the journal specification • Tables have been reformatod to more informative and repetition of the table results in the text has been minimised. • For clarity data from tables 2,3,4,5,6 and Figure 1 have been merged to and data summarized in Table 1 while data from Table 7,8,9,10 and figure 4 summarised and results presented in Table 3 and 4. • All figures has been captioned and their title included below the figure. Figure not clear and not giving results key to the study has been removed • Table 7 has been reformatod for clarity and more data included and now presented in Table 3.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		