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### SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compulsory REVISION comments</th>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) In lines 52-53: “biological diversity adds to the quality of life, providing some of the most beautiful and appealing aspects of our existence”; even though I agree with the author and believe that most readers will agree as well, this sentence is nonetheless extremely subjective. Please rewrite the sentence so that it does not sound so subjective. A suggestion, for example: “biological diversity adds to the quality of life, providing landscapes that can please and appeal to many people”.  
2) In the paragraph starting in line 88, please inform when the questionnaires were administrated. This is very important. | | |

| Minor REVISION comments | 1) In line 9: “Against the background of meteoric rise and alarming increase…”, rise and increase have the same meaning and are thus redundant. I suggest the author should choose only one expression, either “meteoric rise” or “alarming increase”.  
2) In line 36, at the end of the second sentence of the Introduction, please insert pertinent references.  
3) In line 50, I think you could add “ecotourism” to the list of utilitarian reasons.  
4) In line 56, please insert parenthesis after “indigenous people[4]”.  
5) In line 76, you refer to previous studies concerning the Omagwa bushmeat market. Why not include a reference to “Nzeako, S.O. et al. Inventory of harvested wildlife sold at Theomagwabush meat market, Rivers State, Nigeria. Annals of Biological Research, 2016, 7 | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional/General comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6) In line 76, the correct scientific name of the greater cane rat is *Thyronomys swinderianus*, not *Thyronomysswinderianus*.

7) Please correct some other jointed words (typos), “Omagwawas” (line 96), “unanimousin” (line 137), “entryinto” (line 144), “Cameroonarea” (line 146), Cowishaw *et al* (line 166).

8) As from line 168, when you list the guidelines proposed by Cowishaw *et al*, are these sentences modified from Cowishaw *et al* or directly extracted from Cowishaw *et al*? If extracted, quotation marks would be needed.
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