



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_48394
Title of the Manuscript:	Environmental Justice and Women Empowerment in Nyungwe National Park (Rwanda): Case Study of Kitabi Women Handcrafts Cooperative
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/sdi-general-editorial-policy>)

**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>A good empirical research study very much fit for publication by IJECC.</p> <p>However, the study has one major shortcoming which has completely watered down the findings of the paper. This flaw is "sample size". The sample size of the study is too small (Just 12 persons). This small sample size does not permit the the study to draw conclusions based on the general population. Thus, based on the present sample size, the findings of the study can not be considered as very relevant owing to the smallness of the sample size. The author(s) of the study should therefore undertake the research again and increase the sample size to above 60 persons, in order to make the findings of the study more relevant and scientifically robust.</p>	<p>Thank you for the remark. However, we don't agree with the recommendation because the study is focused on the specific category of "Kitabi Women Handcraft Cooperative" that is composed of 30 members only. It is not related to the entire local community. Moreover, it is clearly indicated in the methodology that the "saturation point" was reached with the eighth woman interviewee. As no new information was coming, there was no need to continue with other women. The interviews with RDB Staff members and Local administration officers were just conducted to gather the points of view of these key partners which are quite different from those provided by women.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Good empirical research study fit for publication by IJECC. However, the sample size needs to be looked into again and findings of the paper corrected before the paper can be considered for publication.</p>	<p>Same clarifications mentioned above</p>

**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?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	