



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There is no need for <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The sentences in the Abstract part of the MS should be passive. For example; The authors write as " We visited 235 chainsaw milling (CSM) operations to interview 85 sawyers from 15 villages in the forestry zone surrounding Kumba, Cameroon". I think it is better to write this sentence as " 235 chainsaw milling (CSM) operations have been visited to interview 85 sawyers from 15 villages in the forestry zone surrounding Kumba, Cameroon".	The 1 st sentence of the abstract of the new manuscript version is modified into the following passive phrase: "A total of 235 chainsaw milling (CSM) operations have been visited from 1 st June to 31 st July 2011 in order to interview 85 sawyers from 15 villages in the forestry zone surrounding Kumba, Cameroon. In the field, four categories of sawyers (Type I, II, III, and IV) were differentiated according to their motivations, challenges, production cost and profit".
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In my opinion it is a good planned and well arranged study. It is also based upon detailed field works and good scientific methodology including interviews with the public.	In general, the new manuscript version is fully modified by taking into account all the reviewers' comments.