



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_12906
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACTS OF LAND USE CHANGES ON BIODIVERSITY IN THE MOUNT CAMEROON REGION
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comments (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Firstly, I strongly encourage authors to have their manuscript proofread by a native English speaker or a professional team.	The manuscript has been proofread
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Title. I suggest use 'forest biodiversity' instead of only 'biodiversity' in the title. Introduction section. The third paragraph (Lines 54-82) is too much long. Please, split it into 2-3 paragraphs. Number citations should be replaced by first author's last name and publication's year in the lines 45, 46, 55 (12), 63 (15), 70 (18), 98, 114, 332, 336, 339, 340, 344, 359, 362, 363 and 377. Figure 1 has not good quality.	The correction has been effected, see line 29 This has been done, see lines 57 and 73 The citations have been corrected, see highlighted author citations in the manuscript The figure has been improved upon, see page 4
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript examines the impact of land use changes on the forest biodiversity of the Mount Cameroon from July 2009 to November 2010 using questionnaires, group discussions and remote sensing techniques. The work is well executed, but the text needs improvement regarding to the grammar.	The grammar has been checked and improved as proposed