

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_96318
Title of the Manuscript:	The Potentials of Beekeeping activities in enhancing local livelihoods and climate change adaptation in Semi-arid areas of Tanzania
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljaeri.com/index.php/JAERI/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes it is important. According to this research, apiculture is positively transforming lives of farmers in the sampled areas. Greater Government intervention e.g. subsidy on modern hives, could catalyse spin-off economic activities (financial freedom, better standard of living, more purchasing power or disposable income, less dependence on the state, better housing etc).</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. No</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes. The author has articulated well See the attachment</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. I suggest that most long sentences be shortened for clarity</p> <p>2. The conclusion needs a little more details. I recommend that the positive findings be highlighted. Refer to the introductory section and convince the reader that for example a) beekeepers are still using traditional approaches and making a living out of it. However, by simply adopting new hives, their honey yields and other products could double/triple?? b) if the new hives are imported then the Government could consider import tax waiver to make them cheaper and affordable c) That when people are financially independent, they do not place a burden on the state regarding their health, schooling etc but instead they reinvest creating employment opportunities, adding value to the market supply chain, leads to greater revenue to the state etc</p> <p>3. Why are the majority using traditional hives? Is it cost? Availability? It will greatly add value to this article to clearly state why this is a problem and how it can be addressed.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paul Mmtoni Barasa
Department, University & Country	University of KwaZulu Natal, South Africa