



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJAEES_16095
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Community-Based Forest Management Program as a Strategy on Forest Restoration Using Rainforestation Approach in Cienda and San-Vicente, Baybay City, Leyte
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	Issues of community participation in biodiversity conservation attract a lot of interests from many stakeholders especially today as conservationists and government alike realise the role of local communities in the conservation discourse in natural resource rich countries. However, this study has some weaknesses that make the paper difficult to appeal to international readers in its current form. I have presented my comments in two major sections; the general comments section stating important areas requiring major reviewing and specific/minor section pointing areas that can be corrected without major revisions. The paper in its current form is not materially and technically sound to be considered for publication in this journal. GENERALCOMMENTS -objectives/purpose of study-the objectives should be pitched higher, especially objectives 1 & 2. To just describe the socio-demographic characteristics of an association is not appealing, unless these had a direct bearing on the results. In fact that simple description will fit in the methods sections or as part of explaining the characteristics of respondents and not as an independent research result. Also to have another objective which just 'identifies' indicators is too simplistic. The reader would be interested in the analysis/assessment of such indicators. If the identified indicators were linked or correlated to some outcome or behavioural trait it would be interesting. - Methods-site selection-authors can explain why they chose the two villages instead of more. Is it that these are the only villages found in the study site?	In regards with the first comment, I already removed my first objective which is to look on the socio-demographic profile of the interviewees. I just include this data on some of my discussions because it creates significant results on the outcome of my study. As explained in the methodology, I chose the site due to it's accessibility and because of its tenurial instrument used which is the main focus of my



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-Pre-testing of survey instrument-authors do not state how many respondents were used in the pre-testing exercise. -Sample size- authors talk of a survey and interview but do not clarify at this stage whether and how they used the two data collection methods. The sample size is not stated and this is a weakness. Although a formula for sample size calculation is provided, there is no evidence of its use in terms of computing to come up with the actual sample used in this study. In other words the sample was not computed, e.g. in this case what is the real value of N, E? How was sampling done? -Data Collection-This section is not explaining all the instruments used for data collection by the authors. It is not clear how many respondents were administered with a questionnaire, and this should be included here. -Focus groups-the number of focus groups, their size and composition is not stated. The purpose of the focus groups and what they discussed are largely not explained. Were there any questions or issues discussed by the focus groups? -Results and discussion-indicators-there are four indicators listed by the authors but it is not clear where these indicators were obtained from. Were these obtained from the respondents or literature review? If obtained from respondents in the current study then perhaps a table presenting these indicators and level of responses would be more insightful. If not then this should have been explained in the methods section that community preparedness and participation is going to be assessed against indicators from a previous study. -Conclusions-what are the conclusions based on the study objectives or questions? There are no conclusions or recommendations here. Conclusions should be based on what the authors think basing on their objectives and results and then recommendations should naturally flow from the results and conclusions. In the current paper, what is placed under conclusions and recommendations seem to be more of discussion. This section need to be reviewed as it is important in this study where readers want to know the authors minds about what they found.	study. I noted the number of participants for the pre-testing at my methodology. Sample size- please see methodology Please see methodology I noted that the results on the four indicators where partly modified by the study of Raink and Decker. Results were made due to the output of the interview and data collection which was later formed to be an indicator of success in CSVFA Revision of the conclusions were made already
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	-Abstract-it will be more informative for the abstract to indicate the objectives, sample size, sampling methods, conclusion(s) and recommendation(s). - Introduction-review grammar, e.g. in line 31, the 'on' between 'application' and 'the' should be changed may be to 'of'. -objective (1) and (2) should be reviewed to reflect higher order objectives. -Methods-Pre-testing of survey instrument-how many respondents were used for pre-testing? -Results-level of environmental awareness-lines 171-to sentence ending in 175 are part of the methods. -importance of rainforest farming-sentence beginning line 200 is interesting, but there is need for more explanation to link deforestation to irrigation challenges. It is of cause common knowledge that deforestation affect the hydrological cycle, but in this case a rainfall variability or pattern linked to deforestation would be more informative. -sense of ownership-line 241-willingness is defined, but the authors failed to define the other key word, 'belongingness'. The meaning of key words should not be left to the reader to interpret as this should be contextualised by the authors unless the meaning in general. -Table 4-further analysis could have produced more results, e.g. were there any significant differences between those who responded with a 'yes' and those who respondent with a 'no'. -Figure 2-some of the reasons need reviewing, e.g. 'because of the impact', now which impact is this? 'they have started it' the question is who started it and what is 'it' refereeing to?	Minor comments on the article were already noted by the author in order to make improvement on the manuscript submitted
---------------------------------------	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-lines 261-268 under Fig. 2 seems misplaced and the appropriate place should be before Table 4. -Table 5-why did the authors confine their analysis to members only when the subheading states otherwise? A comparison of members and non-members on perceptions about benefits could have been more interesting. And in this table were multiple responses allowed? -Table 6-the same comments as for table 5 apply here. This study is about effectiveness of a program and one of the more effective ways of assessing such effectiveness is to make comparative analysis among different groups of stakeholders. Here comparing perceptions between members and non-members could have produced interesting results. -CSVFA's Framework-line 303-authors introduce the term 'pillars', where were these pillars sourced from, e.g. who provided the information constituting these pillars? -Fig 3 is of interest and this could have formed the theoretical framework for this study. -Table 7-provide the year of your source. -References- review the reference beginning line 393, is the year of update 2001 or 2011?	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Some of the comments here repeat what has been covered above The approach lacks critical analysis of issues raised, e.g. why were there glaring differences between members and non-members. Do members and non-members live in the same village and how is membership attained? In some areas there was need for the application of statistical tests to test the relationships between different data sets. The sample size was not clear.	