



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	General comments In the hole text, there are many acronyms non defined. It is essential to define all of them. Title This title is too descriptive, it must be rewritten Executive Summary At line 12, you must simply replace "This study" which appears in two consecutive sentences. A summary is the condensed form of a text; the proposed summary follows no logic and must be rewritten. Introduction The argumentation in the introduction is poor. There are a lot of works on the topic of community based forestry. Methodology You cannot quote name of places like that without presenting a location map The methodology does not precise the nature of the data to be collected (Measured variables must first be specified in the methodology; it is not in the results we will discover them. Also, authors should also tell us the indicators they will measure; it is not in the results we will discover them). Concerning the number of samples, the formula to be used to calculate the sample size was announced but we have no idea of the sample there. It is not in the result you should present this. There are other elements of the methodology that we discovered only in the result, put them in the methodology section Results and discussion I do not understand also why the profile of the respondents was considered as results. It is you who have chosen to investigate	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	people and why this should be a result. For me section 3.1 is not a result This paper has been not discussed; I can understand why authors talk about R&D, there is no discussion in the paper.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Kokou Kouami</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Faculty of Sciences, Université of Lomé, Togo</i>