



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
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	Research 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 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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors present an interesting paper concerning impacts of land use changes on biodiversity. I like the overall idea and the methodology of the paper that gives interesting results. However, my main concern is related to the general presentation of the manuscript which needs some more work. Discussion should be more extensive and enriched, but sentences belonging to "Results" should be omitted, in order to give more emphasis to the interesting results. Conclusions should include a "take home message" concerning impacts of land use changes on biodiversity in the studied area. Table 1 can be omitted and its information can be added in maps' legends. Table 3 can also be omitted and its data can be found in the text as is also the case for Figure 2. References should be checked carefully according to the journal's style. In addition, although I'm not a native English speaker, I believe that the authors should make a linguistic revision of the manuscript. Thus, I recommend a major revision of the MS so that science presented, which is interesting, can be communicated more effectively.	The presentation has been improved upon and proof read The statements pertaining to results have been removed from the discussion, see pages 9 – 12 The tables and figure 2 have been removed The references have been corrected, see highlighted texts The manuscript has been proof read and adjusted



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	All over the manuscript, in some sentences there are missing spaces or more than one space between words. Page 2, last paragraph, line 53: there is not a reference 10a, so 10b should be 10. Page 3, line 70: there is not a reference 17b, so 17a should be 17. Page 4, lines 101-102: Please rephrase Page 5, lines 133-134: The sentence is not clear Discussion: There are sentences that belong only to results. Page 14, line 378: "were one of the ..." should be "was one of ..." References should be checked carefully (for example references 1-2 don't include the titles of the papers)	All formatting has been done and the manuscript revised This has been corrected All references have been checked and corrected This section has been removed when summarising the manuscript as proposed by other reviewers Results have been removed from the discussion, see page 9 The correction has been done, see line 328 The references have been checked and corrected as proposed by the reviewer
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		