



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_33070
Title of the Manuscript:	Community Participation in Environmental Conservation and Protection : A Case study of Kida community, Hawul local Government Area of Borno State, Nigeria.
Type of the 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Methodology & Results: • Please spend some time integrating the various techniques to capture and communicate your findings. I think this could be a very nice and interesting paper but it requires more details and examples. • Show questionnaire. • Where are results from interviews and focus groups? Specific narratives would be helpful. • I don't understand why data always adds to number of questionnaires. Why can't people be exposed or interested in more than 1 problem? • Table 2: This concerns the participation rate not their interest in environmental protection. • More on why not willing to participate... e.g., not enough time, revenge, etc.. • Often activity vs perceived importance is separated and measured independently. for example, rate 1 through 10 on govt involvement in area and then 1-10 on perceived importance. • Are the recommendations from authors, literature, interviews. Include a narrative of how fit into a system-incentivizing, maintaining, feedback/monitoring, education. • When government is mentioned, at what level- federal, state, local? • How many of these problems are associated with the	1. Integration of techniques included. 2. Results of interview are presented in italics and quotes within text. 3. Irrelevant to show questionnaire. 4. Focus groups narratives are as shown in italics. See section 5.1 5. For the purpose of article un-retuned questionnaires are not presented. 6. See section 5.2 highlighted 7. Irrelevant because the respondents are in the core villages and that is the experience and what is or are the factors they experience. 8. See section 5.2 highlighted. 9. State government 10. Irrelevant and not within the scope of the research.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Tragedy of the commons?	
Minor REVISION comments	• This paper should be sent to an editor to make it more consistent and readable. • Sentences should not start with a [. For references at the beginning, place the name then brackets around the year, e.g., "Lele [1975]" instead of [Lele 1975] at the beginning of the sentence in the second paragraph in section 3 • Last sentence of abstract not a sentence maybe try something like "... evident, such as problems associated ..." • First sentence 1.1: maybe simplify to "To achieve the main goal of this study, the objectives include:" • Last paragraph on page 102- This has good information. I think "Rearsing" should be "rearing". Also an inset map to put the area in perspective would be nice.	1. Manuscript has been proof read. 2. Citations has been taking of and corrected 3. Abstract corrected as in revised manuscript. 4. Sentence improved 5. Noted and corrected.
Optional/General comments		