



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAERI_14178
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic valuation of rice crop damage by Red-billed Quelea and other pest birds on a rural irrigation scheme in western Kenya
Type of the Article	Research

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	Method as used by the author should be changed to Methodology to show the set of methods and principles used. This is not the same as a particular way of doing things known as method. In data analyses, mathematical expression should have been used for variables measured rather descriptive adopted making the paper voluminous. The authority of the economic model used must be stated. 95% probability level is not the same as confidence interval (Interval shows mean variation within lower and upper limits). Thus, it is either alpha level or probability level. The economic models require assumptions which were not distinctly stated but mentioned as part of the write up. The discussion suppose to be pure write up and into sections such as economic valuation. This section should be under results and not in discussion. The use of 2001 figures to estimate 2014 values may not be adequate i.e 13 years ago and with a population growth rate of 3% for most African countries, the population will have doubled by now	• Methods is now changed to Methodology • Much of the long descriptive aspects data analysis section is now removed • The formulae used in estimating rice damage (economic model) are now attributed to authority and the assumptions are stated • "95 % confidence interval" is now corrected to "95 % probability level" • For dividing the discussion into subsections, this is allowed by the journal guidelines, but more importantly, it is to make it easier for readers to focus on elaborations of various components as earlier outlined in the results • Reference to 2001 figures for rice imports was meant to be 2011 figures. This is now corrected
Minor REVISION comments	Fig. 2 describes quantity and not quality as written in Y-axis (Quelea 53%; weavers 36% etc)- This is quantity. Check fig. 2 for correction. P. 17 –postharvest and port harvest. P.31-34 to be deleted for repetition of figs 1, 2, 3 and Table 1 respectively. The comparison of the result of	• The correction on fig 2 has been effected to read "quantity" • Post-harvest has been corrected to post-harvest • Table 1 and figure 1, 2 and 3 that were repetitions are now removed. However we



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the study with that of Senegal is not necessary in this paper as this could be done in another paper using student t for the analysis between East and W. Africa. Adequate discussion on senegal should be removed to reduce the volume of the paper. Finally, references should be properly punctuated e. g no 9 Parson KC to read Parson, K.C., with single line spacing.	have also supplied the figures separately as JPEG high resolution • The discussion part comparing Ahero rice scheme study area with that in Senegal is now reduced substantially to leave only a short statement, primarily to put the results in perspective of case in that country, which is among the biggest rice belts in Africa. • Reference system suggested by reviewer does not seem to conform to the journal's instructions for authors
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please clarify the ethical issues if any	• No ethical issues arose or were involved in the study and hence we have indicated/declared the “not applicable” notation