



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_42471
Title of the Manuscript:	Firewood Utilization and Its Impacts on Vegetation and Land Degradation Around Mopipi Village in Central District of Botswana
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 The data collection methods should be clear, i.e. how many data collection instruments were used and why? Currently its not clear as there are different sets of households, e.g. 79 households were interviewed for what? And these different from another sample of 383 households provided with the questionnaire? There were also transects and quadrats-these need clarification and justification. Inafact the lack of objectives or purpose of the study in the abstract confuses the reader on the data collection methods used. MATERIALS AND METHODS Line 154: it is not clear which measurement method was then used as a statement just reads, ‘ The latter appears to show the most promise.....,’ Line 180: was the distance of 100m between quadrats per location and if so what was the design within the transect? Perhaps a sketch diagram could have been more illustrative. Lines 191-193: Do the 383 households exclude the 79 households interviewed, and why were some subjected to an interviewed and others to a questionnaire? Few explanations would help the reader to understand why this was the case. How was data from interviews and questionnaires analysed? This is not indicated in the analysis. RESULTS The results for objective number 3 are not included in this section. Perhaps it would help the authors to have key subtopics in the results derived from the objectives so that the reader is satisfied that all the objectives are addressed. Results from the regression analysis mentioned in the methods section are missing. DISCUSSION Line 318: discussion centers around those households interviewed, what about the others? Line 333: There are no results on gender issues, therefore its diffuclt to discuss as results, perhaps this can go to the introduction section. CONCLUSION The conclusion needs to be revised. It should conclude on the objectives based on the results. Currently this is not the case.	- Has been attened - see ms - OK - OK attended - Ok - Has been corrected – see Methodology - SPSS - Objectives have been modified in relation to the results – see ms - Regression analysis was for the basal area of the tree and its canopy to determine the biomass of the woody component. Distance were not regressed



SDI Review Form 1.6

--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	ABSTRACT Justify why households of 8 people were chosen and not those households with less or more numbers? Keywords- should be listed in alphabetical order and Botswana is a country name, so why is it used as a key word? INTRODUCTION Line 38: Briefly explain why there has been a decline in the use of firewood. Line 42: The statement is less informative, e.g. what do education, health and manufacturing industries use firewood for? Line 45: Should be qualified, e.g. what is causing biomass production to be unsustainable? It is unsustainable to who? Line 56: The statement which reads, ' Despite the fact that firewood is the most important source of primary energy in Botswana, there is a wide gap in knowledge of firewood availability around most of the settlements.' Is not clear to the extent that it can be contradictor as most of these people have lived in the same area for long, unless this is a research knowledge gap which should be clarified. Line 77: What is LPG? Normally this is written in full on first time of use and the abbreviations bracketed to avoid misinterpretations. MATERIALS AND METHODS Line 110: grammar; a word is missing between 'mainly' and 'arenosols' Fig. 1. Map of Boteti sub-district showing Mopipi village, if the resolution can be made more clearer the better Lines 122; 123; 129; 130; 135; 138 should have references Line 149: Authors make reference to the annual growth rate of 3.5 percent for the study area but did not include the national growth rate which they made reference to. Line 154: it is not clear which measurement method was then used as a statement just reads, 'The latter appears to show the most promise.....',-ok Lines 161 and 162: its not clear, was the survey for 'firewood' or it was for 'woody vegetation' as reference is made to live and dead wood per kg/ha??? The difference between vegetation and firewood should be clear. Line 191: There is no justification why households of 8 peopel were selected and not others. RESULTS Lines 215 & 244: the Table captions are on diffrenet pages to the actual Table. Line 256: it is also more informative to include the actual responses, e.g. 55.7% ($n = ?$).	- Has been attended - OK. corrected - ok - ok - ok - removed - ok - ok - ok - ok
---------------------------------------	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Lines 263-267: I suggest the lines be removed as this is not part of the results, but more of discussion. Table 3 and 4: include actual response on 'Respondent' e.g. 88.6% ($n = ?$). Line 309: Authors should explain how they arrived at average use of 10 kg per day. DISCUSSION Line 318: discussion centers around those households interviewed, what about the others? Line 321: Where is 'Badladesh'? I suspect its a wrong spelling? Line 331: include a reference here. Lines 357-361: this reads more like recommendations. REFERENCES The reference list should be realigned well. Confirm the in text referencing is according to the journal requirements.	People always collect dead wood, but if it is exhausted in certain areas the chop live trees and keep it dry at their homes. Has been corrected Ok Ok
Optional/General comments	Areas needing major revision include the methods, results and conclusion as highlighted in my comments.	