

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. <b>Yes, because the thematic studied here is important to understand the effects of deforestation and the the results obtained are very interesting</b> 2. <b>Yes</b> 3. <b>Yes</b> 4. <b>In part. Some of the figures like 2 a. c, 3 c and f aren't necessary.</b> 5. <b>Some words and spaces should be reviewed.</b> 6. <b>The references should be more recent and some of them aren't referred in the subsection References such as: Taylor 2005. And in the subsection the references aren't referred to in accordance with the rules of the journal</b>  7. <b>The Introduction should be developed is too weak in the argumentation</b> 8. <b>The Section Results and Discussion should be developed because the discussion presented is weak.</b> 9. <b>The formal aspect of the article should be reviewed and put in accordance with the rules of the journal</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1. There are parts that should be reviewed	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Corrections in the article are important in order to be accepted	

### 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)
<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:	Rosa Branca Tracana
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic of Guarda, Portugal