

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRAF_103096</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of the Economic Benefits of conservation Activities at Kwano Chimpanzee Forest Habitat in Gashaka Gumti National Park (GGNP), Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes. Assessing economic and other benefits of conservation of a habitat with simple methods, the manuscript has shown important findings from original research work that has also identified possible strategies for the future. The manuscript is more of qualitative approach with some quantitative presentations such as in percentages.</b></p> <p><b>Yes. Simple and focused title.</b></p> <p><b>It could have included methods of data collection.</b></p> <p><b>Subsection "Statistical analysis" is confusing and should be replaced by 'Sampling and sample size' Under data collection section.</b></p> <p><b>I assume that this is to be published not as an article in economics discipline. But has followed scientific paper writing.</b></p> <p><b>Has provided enough references.</b></p> <p><b>7. Some more issues:</b>                      - I have provided some editorial and other comments using track changes. Please see the attached document (19 pages).                      - there is lack of clarity on stratified random sampling (SRS) and purposive sampling (PS) methods used – what sample did you use SRS for, and for which one did you use PS?                      - Income benefits could have been studied through assessing yearly incomes at least for two years and from different sources                      - Conclusion is not satisfactory as it is simply summary of the findings, especially related to income. The question is what is your conclusion from those findings?</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes. Simple and used terms.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>It is a good work. Such a work can also be extended to clearly bring out the economic benefits (direct and indirect) as well as to dig a bit on non-economic benefits of the conservation activities. Some of the suggested strategies would also motivate researchers to carry further (in depth) study using valuation methods, for example Willingness to Pay (WTP) or Willingness to accept (WTA).</p>	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Worku Tessema</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Hawassa University, Haramaya University, Ethiopia</b>