



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_42853
Title of the Manuscript:	CONSTRAINTS TO AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY IN KAINJI LAKE NATIONAL PARK, NIGERIA
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	<p>Line 65-67: It is not clear why extension of services by Kainji Conservation should result in conflict. Is this due to an increase in the area conserved or displacement of people and disruption of livelihoods? Line 85: Confirm number of questionnaires per community. 30 x 5 districts x 3 communities will be 450 questionnaires.</p> <p>In Table 1, the total population of the five districts (with three communities each) equals 59,823. This presupposes that no other communities exist in the area. Did all communities in the study area constitute the study population? Lines 112- 114: Reference to tables. There is no table showing commonly cultivated crops in the study area. Line 150 (Table 1): Provide proper title and reference of the GEF 2009 report. Lines 144-147: R² values do not march the previously stated values on Line 133. For example, R² for modern input is 0.64 and not 0.82. Correct accordingly.</p>	<p>Line 65-67 has been completely cancelled because it is not meant for this paper Line 85: It has been clearly stated in the author's reviewed manuscript</p> <p>The communities were chosen based on simple randomized technique from the five districts present in the Kainji Lake National Park.</p> <p>The corresponding Line 112-114 has been added to the reviewed manuscript The title of Table 1 has been modified and the reference has been cited Line 144-147: the R² values have been corrected accordingly.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 9- Correct to read: ...was investigated in this study. Line 9- Correct to read: The research assessed Line 11: transfer '.....resulting in 15 villages' to Materials and Methods section. Line 24- should read Malthus and not Mathus Line 33- Start a paragraph Lines 34-35 Rephrase the sentence to read: The relationship between agricultural practices and environment has been relatively stable and favourable but it has in recent times been disturbed by anthropogenic forces, leading to serious environmental degradation. Line 38 Correct to read: ... and the extent to which it is disturbed depends on the nature, intensity 39 and duration of such activity. Line 52 Correct to read: Such affected individuals should have been given the opportunity in the planning process or been offered access to some alternative resources that would substitute their traditional lifestyle. Line 64 Correct to read: In Nigeria, there has been an increase in the number of conflicts vis-à-vis conservation and natural resources protections.</p>	<p>Line 9: has been corrected Line 11: has been corrected Line 24: has been corrected Line 33: corrected Line 34-35: has been rephrased and corrected Line 38: corrected Line 52: corrected Line 64: That particular line has been cancelled from the manuscript and should be removed Lines 73-74: has been corrected Line 81: "By direct observation" Deleted Line 84-85: corrected Line 92: corrected Line 107: corrected Line 109: corrected Line 110: That statement "who produce food crops commonly cultivated in the study area" was referring to a table that was initially missing from the manuscript, but has now been added to the appropriate position.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Lines 73- 74 Correct to read First, questionnaires were prepared and used to collect information on agricultural practices and productivity from the residents around KLNP Line 81- Delete “by direct observation” Lines 84-85 Correct to read: Simple Randomized Sampling technique was employed in selecting the studied villages in each of the five districts in the study area. Three communities were sampled from each district. Line 92- correct to read: ... total acre cultivated. Line 107- correct to “their farmlands” Line 109- correct to “over 20 years”. Line 110- Delete “who produce food crops commonly cultivated in the study area” Line 111- Correct to read “The commonly cultivated food crops in the study area include yam, cassava, groundnut, guinea corn, maize, millet (Plate 1 and 2)”. Line 121- Correct to read:.... As high as 5 acres or more annually. Line 124- Correct to read: Table 3 further shows the average acre cultivated, with 30.5% cultivating less than 124 1 acre.....</p>	<p>Line 111: same as in line 110 Line 121: corrected Line 124: corrected</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Tables 2-4. The Source footnote on the tables should read “Field Data”. Line 118, reference to Table 3: The Materials and Methods section does not justify use of patrilineal system etc. The report should simply use “respondents”. Line 186: Correct spelling is “Recommendations” Line 187: correct to read “.... as it relates to.....”</p>	<p>Table 2-5: corrected Line 186: corrected Line 187: That recommendation has been deleted</p>

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	