



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_45032
Title of the Manuscript:	The role of Indigenous Knowledge on Use and Conservation of Wild Medicinal food Plants in Loita sub-county, Narok County
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	LINE 12: ABSTRACT – The grass. and bushland..... Delete the full-stop before “and” LINE 18: INTRODUCTION – Required fonts mistakenly included LINE 20: depend NOT “depended” LINE 26: Don't use names with [2] LINE 38: consider revising in knowledge indigenous knowledge.. LINE 40-43:MATERIALS AND METHODS- Author instructions mistakenly included. LINE 59-60: Should be National Sample Survey and Evaluation Programme (NASSEP) LINE 60-61: Consider revising block letter used for figure LINE 112: Maasal NOT "maasal" LINE 119-124: These should be reflected in the Recommendations LINE 142: WMFPs should be defined. Acronyms should be defined at first use and subsequently acceptable as such. LINE 248-355: REFERENCES – Block letter format not acceptable. ☐ Paragraphing, fonts, citations, topics, sub-topics, figures, tables and referencing should be in conformity with journal author guidelines as most of these appear to be inconsistent and faulty in this article. ☐ Author should consider relating the citations with discussion better.	ABSTRACT Line 12: The dash before grass has been deleted. <u>On use and importance of the habitats, the forest habitat was ranked 1st as a source of water and wild medicinal food plants and 4th (men) and 2nd (women) for dry season grazing</u> REVISED TO READ The forest habitat was ranked 1st as a source of water and wild medicinal food plants by both men and women and 4th (men) and 2nd (women) for dry season grazing Line 18: Introduction – the fonts have been corrected Line 20: Depended revised to depend Line 26 – using names with [2] has been corrected Line 38 – the statement has been revised to gap in scientific knowledge Line 40-43- the instructions have been removed Line 59-60- Kenya has been deleted to read: National Sample Survey and Evaluation Programme (NASSEP) Line 60-61: block letters used in the figure have been revised into small letters with only nouns retaining block first letter Line 112: 'maasai' has been revised to 'Maasai' Line 119-124 have been reflected in the recommendations Line 142: WMFPs has been defined on first mention. Line 248-355: References have been revised to remove the block letters Paragraphing, fonts, citations, topics, sub-topics, figures, tables and referencing has been revised to reflect the journal guidelines. The citations have been revised to relate to the discussion
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Good research paper with appropriate methodology-application	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	