



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_24991
Title of the Manuscript:	An evaluation of profit margin of sawyers of wood products in the forestry zone surrounding Kumba (Cameroon)
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	Abstract needs reorganization to have better flow of information. Check grammar and use of the right terminologies in the area of timber processing. Introduction: The last three sentences are unnecessary for a publication of this nature. Consider deleting them. Methodology: 1. The 1st 3 paragraphs are too long and the information could be shortened by avoiding what does not add value to the paper. Consider reviewing this. 2. The author could consider using standard economic formulae (they are available) and also use formular maker (available in Microsoft office software) to make formulae more presentable. 3. Consider organizing methodology section in parts to align with the sections discussed in Results. Results: 1. The 1st two paragraphs in 3.1 could be moved to methodology if they are to flow. 2. Consider reviewing the title given to Table 3. 3. The analysis of profits does not seem to indicate the amount of time per operation. This could be important to enable readers appreciate the real time work, costs and profits being discussed. Conclusions: Consider making this section shorter. Just draw conclusion points from the discussed results, short and precise to the point.	Abstract: The 1st four sentences have been reformulated. The amount of time per operation (every two months) is added. The last sentence is reformulated (at the beginning). Some sentences have been deleted and the reorganization of the whole abstract is different from the previous version of manuscript. Introduction: We have deleted the last three sentences from the previous version of manuscript. Methodology: 1-The sub-title 2.1 is reformulated and has been split up into 4 sections (2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3) with different names. 2-The 1st three paragraphs from the previous manuscript version have been deleted and used to write another text. 3-The 2nd paragraph is completely new. 4-The title of table 1 is modified (at the end of the sentence). 5-The content of section 2.1.2 is the information shifted from the results part (from section 3.1 of the previous manuscript). The last sentence of this section 2.1.2 is new. 6-Section 2.4 of the data analysis is split up into sub-sections 2.4.1, 2.4.2, and 2.4.3 7-All the mathematical formulas (1) to (8) in sections 2.4 have been edited by using the formular maker .



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Results and discussion: -The 1st two paragraphs from the previous manuscript have been shifted to section 2.1.2 on the methodology. -Title 3.1 and the 1st paragraph under this heading are newly written/reformulated -Table 3 has a new title. -In section 3.2, the text as well as tables 4, 5 and figures 2, 3 have considered the period of time of “every two months” in their content or titles. Conclusion and recommendations: 1-The conclusion has been shortened and rewritten by highlighting only the main points discussed in the text. Hence, the 1st and 4th paragraphs of the previous manuscript are deleted in order to write a new conclusion. 2-The first sentence of the first paragraph under this section is completely new.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Consider reviewing grammar and flow of information to make the reader comprehend the paper. Consider drawing the readers’ attention to the real issues under investigation, what has been found and the value it adds to the sector. Keep your Title: “An evaluation of profit margin of sawyers of wood products in the forestry zone surrounding Kumba (Cameroon)” in mind through out the discussion to bring out the real issues	All the small mistakes of grammar and vocabulary have been edited in the whole text.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The Paper to my opinion is good and tries to handle important issues in the wood industry. It can be published after the highlighted issues are reviewed.	In general, the new manuscript version is fully modified by taking into account all the reviewers’ comments.