

### Review Form 3

7

Journal Name:	<b>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_120537</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effects of Wetlands Conservation on People's livelihoods Living around Kyetinda and Mabamba Wetlands in Central Uganda.</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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The Manuscript will add new knowledge to the scientific community. 2. I like the fact that it followed the laid down procedures of a research paper. 3. The manuscript has also shown both scientific and technical content.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Suggested Title: Effect of Wetlands Conservation on People's Livelihood around Kyetinda and Mabamba Wetlands , Central Uganda	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is too lengthy. Author(s) should delete some unnecessary points from the abstract. Please check the manuscript for further comments.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes	
<b>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	Manuscript followed the appropriate sequence a research paper should, with empirical evidence. 2. Results were gotten using appropriate scientific tools. 3. It will solve a major environmental problem.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>	References in the referenced list should also reflect in the body of the paper. Please check more comments in the manuscript.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### 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>Andy Etta Bisong</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal Polytechnic Ekowe, Nigeria</b>