



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Title.... this title need revision...An analysis of socio-economic and farm forestry enterprises in selected arid and semi-arid ares (ASALs) of forest zones of Kenya..... The role of social and economic factors in..... Abstract 1. Start abstract with a broad statement of theoretical importance 2. The quantitative data was analyzed using relevant computer based software mainly excel. The qualitative data/information was analyzed 19 using SPSS Package as well as content analysis, deductions and field observations.....delete in abstract 3. line 23& 24 Revise this..... seems that you copied from elsewhere... which table are talking about? 4. Revise the abstract and limit to 200 words.... there is a lot of unuseful statement...sound like some of the sentences were copied from a thesis and e.g line 23/24 Background This section is very poorly written....it needs VERY strong	• The title has been revised as as shown in the manuscript to “The potential of farm-level forestry enterprises by smallscale farmers in selected arid and semi-arid areas (ASALs) in Kenya” • The abstract has been reworked to clearly state the aims of the study, methodology used, results and conclusion to be in line with journal requirement • This has been corrected in the methodology (pg5 ln206-209) and in the abstract • This ahas been corrected in the text • The astract has been modified to be more precise and meet jounal specifications • The background has been rewritten



SDI Review Form 1.6

	literature review on the subject...use relevant policy documents and which must be cited/referenced The study objective is not clear..... and should be restated.... this study aims to investigate the roles of social-economic factors in development of farm..... Methods....Ok Line 149.....154 Reduce to one sentence by saying.... Data analysis was done using..... need to state the cite the version of the software Results and discussion – this section is very poorly written. Here is why 1. A reader does not capture what is being discussed because the objectives were not clear and thus need to be well stated 2. The background information does not prepare one to read the discussion due to lack of literature 3. It needs to be reorganized to a few but stand alone sections e.g what really does the author want to put	highlighting the the missing gaps and reasons for this study. This is supported by previous knowledge that have been referenced. • The study objective has been explicitly outlined in pg3 ln105-112 • The sentence has been modified to include reviewer comment • The result section has been reworked completely including figure and tables and the data discussed vis-a-vis previous studies and its implications on future farm forestry initiatives in Kenya • The study objective has now been explicitly outlined in pg3 ln105-112 • The background has been rewritten highlighting the the missing gaps and reasons for this study.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	across...not clear is it....Is the influence of ...on success of, constraints to - The author needs to identify these key heading and create sub-heading other this is too much - The author can only be convincing if he uses relevant literature to discuss the results [State a key finding and discuss it using past work and give own interpretation.... otherwise what is presented here are results only - Figure caption always below - Results and discussion TOO long and should be reviewed, any information/ figures not key should be deleted - need a brief section on implications for managing farm forestry enterprises at the end check the referencing format within text and in the reference section	- This has been corrected in the manuscript - Discussion of the present data and its comparison with previous studies has been done throughout the text has been done - 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 - 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 - Implications of the present study results on the farm forestry enyterprises have been highlighted in the conclusion section pg13 ln437-448 - References have been formatted to meet journal requirements
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments Ethical issues: Competting interest:	Need statement on how this was addressed.. did you have a permit from government, consent to do the interviews If any competing interest please clarify.	This was a ministry authorised exercise had letters to that effect.