

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_126051
Title of the Manuscript:	DEGRADATION OF FOOD WOOD SPECIES OF SUDURE AND THEIR PREFERENCES BY THE LOCAL POPULATION OF THE SUDANIAN AND SAHELIAN ZONES OF NIGER.
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I appreciate this manuscript for its focus on a critical issue sustainable management of food resources which directly impacts food security and ecosystem health. However, it could benefit from further discussion on the implications of these findings for biodiversity conservation strategies in Niger.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>Not</b> Degradation of Edible Woody Species and Their Preferences Among the Local Population in the Sudanian and Sahelian Zones of Niger	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<b>Yes, the analysis part</b>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, but need to improve	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The author need to improve, grammatical sentence	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It is ok, but he need, to find the recent reference	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Yes, but need to be improve	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Kokou Kokouvi Bruno</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>African Centre of Excellence in Neglected and Underutilised Biodiversity (ACENUB), Malawi</b>