



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	2014_ARRB_14267
Title of the Manuscript:	Local livelihood of adjoining communities in Yankari Game Reserve, Bauchi-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>)



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	First and foremost, I don't think that this article suits the objectives of the journal Annual Research & Review in Biology. The research conducted is social science, very little attention has been paid to the ecological processes at stake here. The paper would be more suitable for the Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International or Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International of this same publisher. Second, the paper needs a firmer theoretical basis. It would be interesting to see more theoretical approaches to the livelihood-development nexus. In the introduction it is mentioned, but it is best to have an additional section dealing with the theory. Third, this paper is almost completely descriptive. It lacks a discussion about the relationship between livelihoods, poverty and conservation. Sometimes it touches upon it, but it really needs a more thorough discussion. Some attempts have been made to see the correlation between income and education, and occupation and income, but none of the correlations were statistically significant. English and grammar as well as style errors need to be corrected. Kindly revise, or let someone revise it.	I have no objection in the choice of journal for publication of this article of ecological background. However, it should be noted that for the simple reason that a survey design was used does not make the research to be social science oriented. Because scientists finds this design good for study that involves human communities. Thank you so much for the observation. However, the beauty of an empirical work lies in the result, but opinion paper, of which this paper is not, deals extensively with theoretical basis. Discussion has been intensified.(Highlighted) Attempt has been made
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 8: 'total 80' should be 'N=80'. Line 18: 'Socio-economic' should be 'socio-economic characteristics'.	All corrections on the said lines has been effected (Highlighted)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 25: Define poverty. Line 27: Reformulate the sentence, incorrect grammar. Line 67: Explain how your thesis will contribute to existing knowledge. Starting from Line 69: Tell us the complete area size, total population size? Line 72: Wiki camp should be Wikki camp? Line 79-81: Why is mentioning hot springs relevant? Do they contribute to the tourism industry? Line 105: Map is unclear, kindly provide another one. Line 128: Show a map of the research areas. How many people are living there in total? Line 165: 'lands' should be 'land'. Line 174-175: This is not in concord with World Bank. In what way is it in concord? Line 193-200: Interesting discussion, would be nice to extend it more. Line 208: Kwala should be with capital K. Line 209-215: The correlations are not significant, so we cannot really say something meaningful about them. Table 1: Needs editing in terms of style and spelling errors. Line 233: Conclusion section needs to be more comprehensive. Line 244: Write in your body about the LEEMP project, it is the first time you mention it.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	You have collected a lot of information, so I encourage you to rewrite the paper, and submit it to another journal.	Thank you