

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_113952
Title of the Manuscript:	Livelihood Restoration Options for Mining Affected Areas in Kalyana Karnataka Region
Type of the Article	

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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, it is important for the scientific community</p> <p>2. The title of the study needs modification. It is suggested that the title of the article should read "Assessing the Sources of income and other Livelihood Options among households in mining communities of Kalyana Karnataka Region, Zimbabwe or Ethiopia or Cameroon</p> <p>3. Yes but needs modification. The abstract should have one paragraph with not more 250 words, stating the main objective of study, methods of data collection and analysis. Result should be stated clearly with recommendations.</p> <p>4. Subsections are ok but need a section for Key words. The introduction is too brief. The methodology should be replaced with methods of data collection. The researcher didn't tell us the exact population of every village where the study was conducted but used random sampling to collect his/her data. Scientific approach should be used to state the sample size (Yamane or Krejcie and Morgan etc). State your study population in your methods of data collection. In terms of the result, statement like majority, most of, some of or few of them should not be use because the study is purely quantitative.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is ok but needs modification as in above</p> <p>6. Thirteen references are not enough to be considered for this study. You should look for relevant literature online to add value to your work.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Is ok	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> No	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Yazid Abubakar
Department, University & Country	Bayero University, Nigeria