

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_95923
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative analysis of woody vegetation population parameters in disturbed and undisturbed sites of a secondary montane forest</b>
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:

(<https://www.journalajraf.com/index.php/AJRAF/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>The manuscript could be important for the scientific community to bring in an intervention that will lead to afforestation, regeneration strategies as well as formulation or review of policies that are relevant to forestry management and protection of the environment.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The title needs to be reworked as I feel the phrase “population parameters” appears to be confusing. In addition, the identity of the study is not complete as there is no mention of where the study was conducted. My proposal will be to drop out the confusing phrase and add the country where the study was conducted to read “Comparative analysis of woody vegetation coverage in disturbed and undisturbed sites of a secondary montane forest in Kenya”. Or the phrase “population parameters could be left as it is but being defined properly or be qualified.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The abstract appears to be lacking some tangible facts like a summary of the findings, challenges and proposed way forward, just to mention a few. An abstract is supposed to be a shorter version of the main report. It has included much of the information from the methodology section. See the comment in the track changes regarding some information included making it like a methodology section. In addition, it should not be a copy and paste from the other sections.</b></li> <li>4. <b>The structure of the manuscript appears to be a traditional one and is in order. I would, however, just want to propose an inclusion of a section on the challenges and the proposed way forward.</b></li> <li>5. <b>Basing on the data and facts presented, I feel its scientifically correct. Some facts presented were observed to be difficult to tell/establish the message and there are some facts that need to be backed with facts and data to make an informed judgement. Avoid repetition of facts. Comments in track changes of the document may help the author in some cases.</b></li> <li>6. <b>Note that some of the facts presented in the document need to be backed by references and this has been mentioned in the track changes of the document. Not all references on the list have been used in the document. Only 32 of the total 36 appear in the document and those not appearing are numbers 14, 20, 21 and 32.</b></li> </ol> <p>Be consistent in the presentation of references in the whole document. Thus numbers representing the references or the whole information of the references.</p> <p>Consider adding a section on the challenges and proposed way forward to the report.</p> <p>The conclusion part needs to be reviewed and it should be consistent with what has been provided for in the whole document. It is not supposed to be a copy and paste of what is in the Results and Discussion section but rather a summary of the findings which is also supposed to be part of the Abstract.</p> <p>All the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols should be written in full followed by the abbreviations/acronyms themselves when they appear in the document for the first time, thereafter, the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols can be used.</p> <p>Avoid making sentences that are not connecting very well as observed in Sections and sub-</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>sections as well as repetition of facts which has been observed to be common especially in the Introduction Section (see my comments in track changes).</p> <p>Consider numbering all the Sections including the references or adding page numbers for easy referencing.</p> <p>Tables and Figures need to be properly introduced in the sections instead of just making reference to them.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p><b>The answer could be no as well as yes and comments have been made to this regard. Please refer to the comments in track changes. Consider using words or phrases that are scientifically and professionally correct to be using and not words or phrases like “ a tree investing in height, investment in lateral branches” in a document</b></p> <p><b>Proofreading of the whole document to correct the grammar, typos, tenses etc including rephrasing/reconstruction of some sentences as well as taking out repeated statements</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Consider reviewing the title of the study and making a mention of the country where the study was conducted.</b></p> <p><b>The conclusion part is observed to be too shallow and needs to be reviewed. It should be consistent with what has been provided in the whole document. It is not supposed to be a copy and paste of what is in the Results and Discussion sections but rather a summary of the findings which is also supposed to be part of the Abstract.</b></p> <p><b>It is a good study that can help in the management of the forest sites as well as the environment in general because of the biodiversity aspect. However, there is a need to provide more details to the study and this should include the problems/challenges as well as the proposed way forward based on the experience generated from the study and other studies done in the region and beyond as evidenced by the references included.</b></p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>James Peaches Phiri</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Malawi</b>