



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAERI_14132
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic value of agricultural land for community livelihoods within the context of REDD+ in villages adjacent to Mgori forest in Singida rural district, Tanzania
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 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	1. Grammatical errors: - Line 6: <i>A study was carried in two villages...</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>A study was carried out in two villages...</i> - Line 296: <i>The chi-square test indicates further...</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>The chi-square test indicates s further...</i> - Line 298: <i>These results imply that...</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>These results imply that...</i> - Line 403: <i>Despite that the study results suggests that...</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>Despite that the study results suggest that...</i> - Line 465: <i>...contributing factor has been rapid population growth.</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>...contributing factor is the rapid population growth.</i> - Line 488: <i>These results are similar to...</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>These results are similar to...</i> - Line 514: <i>... appropriate land use decisions require better understanding...</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>... appropriate land use decisions require better understanding...</i> - Line 615: <i>Agricultural remains to be a key sector in terms of supporting community...</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>Agricultural remains to be a key sector in term of supporting community...</i> 2. Literature review - Line 114: <i>Moreover, various reviewed literatures in Tanzania and other parts of the world clearly showed</i>	- All grammatical errors are valid and we have corrected as per reviewer's comments - Suggested additional experiences of similar case in other countries or regions have been added on literature part as per reviewer's comments - The statements "<i>However is subsistence managed by smallholders' farmers who in most case do not make use of improved agricultural practices</i>" have been revised.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>that...</i> <u>Suggestion:</u> Please very briefly preview several previous experiences of similar case in other countries or regions. 3. The construction of sentences ▪ Line 616-617: <i>However is subsistence managed by smallholders' farmers who in most case do not make use of improved agricultural practices.</i> <u>Suggestion:</u> Please revise this sentence.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	1. Key words: Please add one or two keyword(s) 2. The Citations and References ▪ Line 42: <i>Gibbs, 2009</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>Gibbs et al., 2009</i> (Should tally with the reference list, please check again) ▪ Line 42: <i>Maitima et al., 2009</i> (in the text), but no in the reference list. ▪ Line 49-50: <i>(Coxhead and Southgate, 2000; Pagiola and Holden, 1999, Thomas, 1998)</i> (in the text), but no in the reference list. ▪ Line 52: <i>(Pagiola and Holden, 1999)</i> (in the text), but no in the reference list. ▪ Line 53: <i>Majule et al., 2010</i> (in the text), but no in the reference list. ▪ Line 61: <i>FPAN, 2009</i> (in the text), but no in the reference list. ▪ Line 97: <i>Tsikata, 2001</i> (in the text), but no in the reference list. ▪ Line 153: <i>UN-REDD, 2009</i> (in the text), but no in the reference list. ▪ Line 160 – 197 From who/where the author(s) know the info? Any reference? ▪ Line 231: <i>Mwakalobo, 2010</i> (in the text), but no in the reference list. ▪ Line 252-253: <i>IFPRI, 2007; Navrud and Pruckner, 1996; Pearce and Turner, 1990</i> (in the text), but no in the reference list. ▪ Line 424: <i>Action Aid (2013)</i> (in the text), but no in the reference list. ▪ Line 451: <i>Majule et al. (2012)</i> (in the text), but no in the reference list. ▪ Line 509: <i>Lagakos and Waugh (2012) and Maitima</i>	1. Two key words have been added 2. All citation and references have been corrected as per reviewer's comments 3. The legend has been corrected as advised by the reviewers, however writers are not sure if have corrected within reviewers intension as it was difficult to understand which is supposed to be removed, is the whole figure? or just the word figure 1? ▪ This comment was not clear to the writers (Line 160 – 197 From who/where the author(s) know the info? Any reference?) 4. All possible mistypes have been corrected 5. All the abbreviations have been corrected
---------------------------------------	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>et al. (2000)</i> (in the text), but no in the reference list. ▪ Please arrange the references in the References list in alphabetical order correctly. ▪ Line 629 and line 632: <i>Abiama, G. (2011).</i> and <i>Abiama, G. (2011).</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>Abiama, G. (2011a).</i> and <i>Abiama, G. (2011b).</i> ▪ Line 636: <i>Dzodzi, T. (2001).</i> There is NO this reference in the text. Please check. ▪ Line 665: <i>Lagakos, D., and Michael, E. W (2012).</i> There is NO this reference in the text. Please check. ▪ Line 683: <i>Majule, A.E. (2010)</i> There is NO this reference in the text. Please check. ▪ Line 707-720: <i>URT (United Republic of Tanzania) (2005)</i> <i>URT (2009)</i> <i>URT (2010)</i> <i>URT (2002)</i> Why so many references from URT? Meanwhile in the text, there is only one i.e. URT (2007) <u>Suggestion:</u> Please check again this reference. If the author is same (like this case), please arrange them based on the year! ▪ Line 734: <i>WB (World Bank) (2008)</i> There is NO this reference in the text. Please check. 3. Figures ▪ Figure 1: The legend is not clear	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	4. Possible mistypes ▪ Line 207: <i>...within the Region.</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>...within the region.</i> ▪ Line 294 – 304 Please add explanation on the percentages of respondents in the category of Household size for 4-6 people. ▪ Line 392: <i>URT, 2007</i> The year does not tally with this reference in the reference list. ▪ Line 418: <i>...about 100% of respondents in Mughunga and 96.7 in Pohama owned...</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>...about 100% of respondents in Mughunga and 96.7% in Pohama owned...</i> ▪ Line 453: <i>In general woodland decreased by...</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>In general, woodland decreased by...</i> ▪ Line 460: <i>However prediction of future land use...</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>However, prediction of future land use...</i> ▪ Line 496-506: <i>...on the trends in agricultural land use and productivity in the study area she said; In recent years crop productivity has declined...</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>...on the trends in agricultural land use and productivity in the study area, she said; “In recent years crop productivity has declined...”</i> ▪ Line 509: <i>Word Bank (2012)</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>World Bank (2012?)</i> The year does not tally with this reference in the reference list. ▪ Line 533: <i>During focus group discussion respondents mentioned...</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>During focus group discussion, respondents mentioned...</i>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. The abbreviations The abbreviations should be explained when they first appear in the text. ▪ Line 9: <i>REDD+</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+)</i> ▪ Line 179: <i>CBFM</i> <u>Should be:</u> <i>Community-based Forest Management (CBFM)</i> ▪ Line 551: <i>FGD</i> <u>Suggestion:</u> What does FGD stand for? The author(s) should mention it in the text.	
---	---	--