

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_75619
Title of the Manuscript:	LAND USE PRACTICES ALONG SAADANI-WAMI-MBIKI WILDLIFE CORRIDOR AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS TO WILDLIFE CONSERVATION
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please check english throughout the manuscript / sentence case too. I have marked some but it needs a revision. 2. You have used Plate 2 and 3 on page 23 but there is no plate, it may have been figure so in such a case make them homogenous use either figure or plate. 3. You have taken data from Institute of Resources Assessment, this should have been mentioned in material and method section. Pls re construct this section so that it is clearer to the reader. 4. You have mentioned appendix I and III. Renumber them as I and II. I haven't seen them in the end of the manuscript? Pls insert them or remove as the case may be. 5. Structure the manuscript as per journal house guidelines. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pls be consistent with font type and size as per the journal house recommendations. 2. Pls check commas and fullstops. 3. I would recommend that pls rephrase sentences and make the manuscript uniform. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>This should be a research or meta-analysis article not a review. There is a nice collection of data and authors own study, both have been corroborated. It is better to be a research article. Authors have put a good amount of effort, I hope they change it as recommended so the manuscript will be nice to read.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Kush Shrivastava</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Nanaji Deshmukh Veterinary Science University (NDVSU), India</i>