

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_97863
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of deforestation on livelihood and the adaptation strategies in Niger south Senatorial District, Niger state, Nigeria
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.journaljaeri.com/index.php/JAERI/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	1) Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community, as it is providing a through input on the impact of deforestation on the livelihood of Niger south Senatorial District, Niger state. This article also provides the strategies implemented to overcome this impact. This article may be considered as literature support for future strategy development and studying the effect of deforestation in Nigeria state. 2) Yes, title of article is suitable. 3) Yes, abstract is comprehensive. 4) Yes, subsection and structure of the manuscript is appropriate. 5) Yes, manuscript is scientifically correct. 6) No, the references are not sufficient. Author may look for further references	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. No, few corrections were required, which has been edited.	
Optional/General comments	The article has been edited as per the scholarly requirement. Therefore, this article now may be considered for publication.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Deepika Trehan
Department, University & Country	ICMR- National Institute of Pathology, India