



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_36839
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmers' perception on integrated watershed management and household annual income evaluation at Maego watershed, North Ethiopia
Type of the Article	Original 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 (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		
Minor REVISION comments	Line 33: what us rapid rate of soil erosion? Please consider paraphrasing this statement to sound less alarmist. You may choose to use standard soil erosion rate quantification of high, moderate and low Line 34: Consider paraphrasing the statement “a serious environmental problems” ypu may use singular or plural but not both Line 43 – consider using “by 2.2%” rather than “of 2.2%” Line 76: Please delete the word “at” between located and 55km Line 81-92: Is all this sourced from FAO 1998? If not please provide citations if so, please also consider more recent publications for this reference. FAO is almost 20 years ago. For sure many trends could have changed in that time period Line 124: Was male dominance part of the research hypothesis? If not, simply report the finding but don't draw conclusions in this section Line 130: check the spelling “Summery” replace with the correct spelling. Summery has a completely different meaning and doesn't fit this context In the methodology, I didn't see the definition of the model used in the analysis and thus the results cannot be properly analysed and interpreted. The sample size of 51 respondents is on significantly low to get a statistically robust analysis especially on socio-economic studies. The conclusion on Age, Education level and Land size of respondents negatively affecting Household income could be as a result of the small sample size which increase the error margin in the sampling. In the analysis there is inadequate reference to previous work done. Especially on the trends resulting from the regression analysis, are there any previous studies that support or contrast such a finding? If none, could we then consider this to be a novel finding? I am sure many such analysis have been done elsewhere and could be of benefit for the author to make comparisons and make further synthesis of his/her findings based on previous studies.	
Optional/General comments	Generally the manuscript is well organised and the author has presented some good data to back the write up. He or she however needs to check some spellings and flow of statements to ensure they portray the right meaning. There is also need for consistency in use of terminologies. In Abstract the Author indicated he/she used GLR yet in the methodology he/she used SLR. There is need to harmonise these terminologies for consistency. The author should also define the Linear Model used e.g. $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \dots + \beta_i X_i + u, \dots$ where Y=Household income, $X_1, \dots, X_i$ re[resenting variables (determinants of income)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eneku Adima Gordon
Department, University & Country	Environment, Busitema University, Uganda