



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_52348
Title of the Manuscript:	Ethnobotanical and socio-economics studies of <i>Dracaena camerooniana</i> Baker in Uíge Province, northern Angola
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**

	<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>TITLE</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested title change: Ethnobotanical and socio-economics studies of <i>Dracaena camerooniana</i> Baker in Uíge Province, northern Angola</li> </ol> <p><b>ABSTRACT</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstract needs to be reconfigured: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less introduction</li> <li>More presentation of results – this is what readers are interested in!</li> <li>It should not exceed 300 words in length</li> <li>See below for prescribed format of Abstract presentation under the following headings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aims:</li> <li>Study design:</li> <li>Place and Duration of Study:</li> <li>Conclusion:</li> <li>Results:</li> <li>Methodology:</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>Keywords to be listed alphabetically</li> <li>For additional editorial issues refer to the accompanied annotated manuscript</li> </ol> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction format: Provide a (1) factual background, (2) clearly defined problem, (3) proposed solution, (4) a brief literature survey and (5) the scope and justification of the work done.</li> <li>Write out abbreviation at start of sentence – cannot start sentence with an abbreviation – correct throughout this manuscript</li> <li>“NWFPs help contributing to food self-sufficiency [5] and food security [5; 6], but also to food diversity [7; 8]” – not sure why 2 sources should be cited, when one is sufficient to make the general point – looks like unnecessary bulking up – can you remove one?</li> <li>“Furthermore, they are constitute a reservoir of firewood for heating (<u>reference number needed</u>), handicrafts (<u>reference number needed</u>), building materials and furniture (<u>reference number needed</u>), instruments of music folkloric and religious (<u>reference number needed</u>); edible (<u>reference number needed</u>), medicinal plants (<u>reference number needed</u>), mushrooms and wild animals (<u>reference number needed</u>).”- Indicate the many sources for the information used in this paragraph – otherwise it is either speculation or plagiarism</li> <li>“<i>D. camerooniana</i> is a monocotyledon plant belonging to the plant family <i>Asparagaceae</i> - family names not typeset in italics – correct throughout this manuscript</li> <li>DRC - write out all abbreviations on first use.</li> <li>Add last sentence of last paragraph: This investigation is of importance to ... (state interest group) in that ... (state reason).</li> <li>For additional editorial issues refer to the accompanied annotated manuscript</li> </ol> <p><b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2.1. Study area: Reformat as very short (3-4 sentences) paragraphs on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraph 1: focus only on location and population</li> <li>Paragraph 2: focus on socio-economic conditions (thus indicating peoples dependence on wild plants for their livelihood)</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 3: focus on topography and climate (rainfall &amp; Temp)</li> <li>• Paragraph 4: focus on associated vegetation type(s)</li> </ul> <p>13. There is too much information in this section that is not needed to understand the results and discussion – remove all irrelevant information not directly linked to any results! For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bacongós, Gingas, N'golas, Muzombos, Muxicongos, Maiacas, Mahungos, Sossos, Massucos, Pombos and Punas [13] – why name these 11 tribes when no further results are linked to them – unnecessary bulking up of the manuscript?</li> <li>• “...from this region is formed in great part with Bantus from Bakongo ethno-linguistics group [16] and they...”- Is any result linked to this linguistic group– if not, why do we NEED to know it? – Unnecessary bulking up of the manuscript?</li> <li>• “White [17] who classified Angola’s north, between the Guineo-Congolian and the Zambezian Regions, calling it the Guinea-Congolia/ Zambezian regional transition zone. Barbosa [18] differentiated the area into six vegetation zones” – is any result linked to these 6 vegetation zones – if not, why do we NEED to know it? – Unnecessary bulking up of the manuscript?</li> <li>• “...relative humidity above 80% and dense fogs...” - is any result linked to humidity – if not, why do we NEED to know it? – Unnecessary bulking up of the manuscript?</li> <li>• “...locally called Cacimbo [15] or Sivu in Kikongo language [16] or Mbangala in Kikongo language – why do we absolutely NEED to know the common names? – Unnecessary bulking up of the manuscript?</li> </ul> <p>14. No value of the information provided (The basic food and main source; The main food crops and income of) in understand the results and discussion of this study – can easily be removed without loss the integrity of the manuscript.</p> <p>15. Section: Plant material collection and identifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why do we absolutely NEED to know the common names of <i>D. camerooniana</i>? – Unnecessary bulking up of the manuscript?</li> <li>• Fig 1(d) <i>D. camerooniana</i> fresh cut leaves - this figure has not been mentioned (in text above fig.) before its placement – remove?</li> <li>• Fig. 2 (a-d). Photographs of <i>D. camerooniana</i>- this is not how you should provide the legend of a montage figure. – see how other published papers have done it.</li> </ul> <p>16. Section 2.4. Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Divide this section into the following sub-headings:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2.4.1 Study population                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Interviews were conducted in the Kikongo language and in Portuguese according to the language mastered by the people surveyed. The selection of the surveyed people was based on people aged between 20 and 65 years old who had sufficient knowledge on the species under investigation, who uses this plant in their daily lives, and who were available at the time of the survey.”- This is called a purposive sampling method – Google it! - A purposive sample is a non-probability sample that is selected based on characteristics of a population and the objective of the study. Purposive sampling is different from convenience sampling and is also known as judgmental, selective, or subjective sampling - Purposive sampling is a sampling technique in which the researcher relies on his or her own judgment when choosing members of population to participate in the study</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ 2.4.2 Questionnaire</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2.4.3 Field survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What was done during the field survey?</li> <li>- “In total, have been visited 12 sampling sites (Fig. 1 – figure 1 does NOT indicate the 12 sampling sites!), and analysed (what parameters were analysed?) 110 D. camerooniana plants.” - Look at how other ethnobotanical studies present this section.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ 2.4.4 Data analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Indicate what analysis was done via ANOVA</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ 2.4.5 Ethical considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Indicate issues of consent. Look at how other ethnobotanical studies present this section</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For additional editorial issues refer to the accompanied annotated manuscript</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This reviewer stopped in at the end of the Materials and Methods section as there are already just too many issues that need attention by the author. This reviewer has already spend in excess of 5 hours on this manuscript – to continue would need at least another 20-30 hours of review, which falls outside the scope of what is expected of reviewers.	

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes. Consent issues must be clarified as people were interviewed</p>	
<b>If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.</b>	Although plagiarism is not suspected, significant amounts of information is presented in the Introduction that have not been attributed to their source.	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Martin Potgieter</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Limpopo, South Africa</b>