Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Geographical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJGR_111069**
Title of the Manuscript:	**LIVESTOCK FARMERS' WILLINGNESS TO PAY FOR FARMING INSURANCE IN THE WEST REGION OF CAMEROON**
Type of the Article	**Original Text**

Review Form 1.7

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 1. **Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. **Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** 4. **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** 5. **Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** 6. **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. **Yes, it is.** **This study is important for government and livestock farmers as the findings could be beneficial for the policy formation and help in the prevention of livestock diseases.** 2. **It is, however, the title should be specific of the areas or divisions the study took place from in West Region of Cameroon. It may read "Livestock Farmers' Willingness to Pay for Farming Insurance in Four Divisions in the West Region of Cameroon.** 3. **Not quite.** **Please provide a brief statement in the abstract about willingness and determinants to pay before stating the aim of the aim. Methods of data analysis are not mention in the abstract. State some of statistical results for Chi Square and logistic regression as shown in the guidelines for authors.** 4. **Some important subsections such as data analysis and tools used to collect data are missing. Snowball alone may not have been appropriate to sample a huge sample size of 484, perhaps you could have employed two sampling techniques given that your study is a mixed method, first you use cluster technique for divisions and from each division you employ snowball sampling.** 5. **The scientific soundness of the paper can be achieved if the manuscript includes important sections of methods and materials such as the type of tools used to collect qualitative and quantitative data and how each of these were analysed. Qualitative results are not provided under results or otherwise methods should have stated how these are to be presented. Furthermore, the Discussion is not adequate, ensure it is logically flowing and in accordance to the specific variables of your study. The authors are also advised to state their attributions to the study findings in this section.** 6. **Wolf and Widmar (2015) from the discussion are not reflected in the references. The rest of the citation are ok**	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**Yes, it is**	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	The first use of any abbreviation or acronym should be first written in full so that your readers know what the abbreviation or acronym means. For instance, you have use LFI a lot in your text. The first time your used LFI in text should be presented as Livestock farmers' insurance (LFI). Please also not that LFI in the abstract should be written in full not abbreviated Good work and best wishes.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Chilufya Muya**
Department, University & Country	**Lusaka Apex Medical University, Zambia**