



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_30373
Title of the Manuscript:	Land resource regimes in Zambia: Implications on local food systems
Type of the Article	Review paper

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	Abstract: 1. The aim of the study should be changed to “to analyze the current resource governance in Zambia and their implications on local smallholder food systems.” 2. The methodology: this section looks too shallow could not even answer then what question for this study. one cannot use this methodology for duplication in other places. It need clear methodology or omit this section because it a review paper. Introduction: Line 12: provide clear definition about natural resource governance (NRG) for the readers. Explain the difference between natural resource management and NRG? Line 16: not clear and related sentence with the starting sentence and topic. Line 20-22: Provide source or reference? This section looks your own idea... have you looked at the effect of agriculture expansion on gazetted land resources then it leads to deforestation and biodiversity losses? This is not acceptable way of discussing this hot issue rather you better suggest sustainable land	Aim changed accordingly Methodology section omitted Clarification to the definition of NRG made and difference with NRM made. Vague sentence removed References and clarification made. Examples of de-gazetted areas and reasons also presented. Narrative beefed to suit global debates on deforestation and biodiversity loss Problem statement has been clarified (Lines 51-58)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	management through improving the benefit from those resources. Line 32-40: Problem statement or the gap or why this review is need, not clearly stated here.....include problem statement clearly before the objective of the study. Line 43: Not clear sub title ...try to write in attractive way. Line 62: Policy? Which are? not clear Line 70-73: Provide reference Line 88-91: Provide reference and the paragraph is too small to convince the reader about the processes. Line 96-97: Data? What kind of data? Secondary or primary document or data? Line 102-103: This looks the documents that you have reviewed as a data? These are not data these are processed documents. Line 105-117: Provide population and land resources related information for the reader in detail Line 110-112: this sentence is controversial as you are talking about degradation and land governance as you are insisting more land for agriculture? Line 118 : change to “resources “ and “state lands” to “state land”	Changed Clarified Reference provided References provided, paragraph length improved and section combined with one immediately above This section has been removed upon reviewer recommendation This section has been removed upon reviewer recommendation More information provided The sentence has been rephrased to indicate that the 47% is a government classification and not the position of the author Clarified Changed to “people” Noted and corrected References provided References provided Noted and enhanced Noted and provided Noted and added
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 188: check: indigenous “peoples”? Line 191: check: exchange “are”? Line 207-216: Lack reference Line 236-238 ; 243-246 and 276-280 : Provide reference. Line 281-282: Provide reference and many argue the reverse (top to bottom approach). Provide very clear convincing statement supporting bottom to up approach here. Line 291-298: Provide reference and you can also suggest that urban agriculture (eg. fruit and vegetable production in Lusaka) to reduce food demand from urban area. Line 322-327: add further convincing sentences Line 359: “These mechanisms could be policies,...” how local community formulate policy ? Because the section “towards a sustainable management of local natural resources” discuss about local sustainable NRM. In addition some argue that top to bottom approach with participation of the various community is better than bottom to up approach....how do you convince your reader in this section? Line 388: the figure should be modified in better quality. Line 390-409: then what? Need slight modification. It does not fully reach the objective of the study. General: It should follow problem statement (gap)>>>objective>>>methodology>>findings> >conclusion.....some missing connection visible in the document.	The bottom up approach is used in sync with top-down approaches (Lines 310-312) and should not stand independently. Hence policy formulation would be done from ‘up’. Conclusion beefed up
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Various minor revision comments are given line by line in "Compulsory_REVISION comments" section so the author(s) should consider the comments given there.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This review document is essential for land resources related policy makers in Zambia. The author(s) presented land resources regimes (only from Agriculture perspective) effects on food production systems but it has omitted other land resources (from such as forest, rangeland, wetland or other) that could generate food for community. The document could have been more interesting to read if it included all land resources governance effect for food production broadly.	Noted with thanks. However the scope of the review was intended enable an intensified review rather than a shallow review covering a larger scope.