



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAERI_14631
Title of the Manuscript:	SUSTAINABLE UTILIZATION OF FOREST RESOURCES: A STEP TO SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE
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://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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	This paper is worth publication, but minor problems in this paper need to be solved before publication. • Introduction should status the main research objective and make a short presentation of the analyzed subject. In addition, in this case, introduction is too short and it is full with quotations. • Introduction should status the main reasons and aspects, which made the author(s) to carry out this analysis. • Please reconsider this part according to the scientific research criteria. • It is recommended that in the introduction to be treated more appropriate and in a personal approaches for the author this subject, more than quoting literature. • Also, it is recommended to insert a new section called "The literature review" where the author(s) should analyze the previous research carried on in this field, or find another way to make this possible • Author(s) should analyze the previous research carried on in this field. Research results can be developed a little more. The discussion is good but the contributions should be clearly stated and more detailed in the	>The objective of the paper has been revised according to reviewer's comment. >For a review work, it is not strange to quote literature and I think the introduction is not really full of quotations as such. >The title of paper suggests more of a new and personal scientific opinion. It may not dwell much on previous work as such. >I think devotion of literature review to a section is not SDI syle, moreover, this is a review paper. >The conclusion is embodiment of my opinion and it spelt out lines of actions to maintain sustainable agriculture as it is. ➤ References have been revised as observed by reviewer. ➤ The presented reference list is the most available please. ➤ Reference number [16] is removed as observed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	conclusion section. • Conclusions should be more personal and reflect better this study. Also, it should reflect future measures. • The references are covering up to date the subject but should be more appropriate to the subject analyzed and more representative for this area of research. • Also, not all the references are typed in consistent with those formats requested by the Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International, it is suggested that the author(s) check the references carefully and make the needed corrections to fit the journal criteria. • (16), doesn't exist in references	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		