



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_48853
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantitative & Qualitative Perspectives of Forest-Water Interactions at Catchment Scales
Type of the Article	Policy 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Good policy article that could be considered for publication by AJRAF. However some shortcomings need to be fully addressed before the paper can be considered for publication.</b></p> <p><b>An analytical approach should be used in discussing the ideas that run through the paper. It doesn't just suffice to describe the basic ideas of the study. Plausible justifications should be given and backed by the research works of other authors. Considering that it is a policy/review paper, it is of the essence to adopt a comparative approach when discussing ideas i.e. compare and contrast the findings of different authors with respect to the subject matter of the study.</b></p> <p><b>Equally, more relevant research works (especially the most recent i.e. 2014 – 2019) should be used when discussing the main ideas that run through the paper. Considering that it is a policy/review study, it is imperative to seek for and cite the research works of various authors in order to give the paper more weight.</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Language and syntax used in the paper should be looked into once more.</p> <p>It is imperative for the symbol "&amp;" to be written in full i.e. "and". This should be rectified across the entire study.</p> <p>Number of research works referenced in the study too small (just 18). More research works should be sought for and referenced.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Good policy paper that could be considered for publication by AJRAF. However, the aforementioned points should be integrated in the work before the paper is considered for publication.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Nyong Princely Awazi</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>University of Dschang, Cameroon</i></b>