



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_42130
Title of the Manuscript:	THREATS AND CONSERVATION INCENTIVES FOR SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF SOUTH WEST MAU FOREST, KENYA
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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract – should include the reason of carrying the research. Results and discussion- Remove the 1st section of general information which covers bio-data since this is not a part of your study. Table 2 and 5 are incomplete and should be improved by indicating the distance from the forest edge and also forest incentives OR should be left out altogether. Some of your paragraphs are too lengthy and should be shortened. Conclusion and recommendations- Remove the 1st portion of bio-data since it was not a part of your study. This section should focus on the study objectives and therefore remove any part that is not relevant to the study. References- Needs to update literature to the current eg. 2016, 2017 and 2018 which are missing.	Abstract: The reason for the study included as suggested by the reviewer Results and Discussion: The first part that covers bio data removed as suggested. Table 2 and 5 removed as suggested by the reviewer and the information contained in the tables explained in writing. The tables were not easy to be reduced due to the valuable contents they contain. Conclusion and Recommendations: The 1st part on bio data removed as suggested by the reviewer. References: This study was carried out in 2015; and this is the reason why the references from recent studies may be lacking. Moreover, the actual facts on the ground might have changed since then hence making deduction from the recent studies may be misleading.
Optional/General comments	Final verdict: Paper should be published after the minor corrections	