



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ ARJASS_48592
Title of the Manuscript:	Environmental Movement and the Conservation of Forest: a Case Study on Ratargul Swamp Forest of Sylhet, Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Short research paper

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Results (in the abstract): Please include the main results including the Percentage/Count etc. - Introduction: Please include your objectives, problem statements and aim - Results & discussion: There is no clear statement of the results. - Conclusion: I am not sure whether you answer the objectives or not - References: There are only 5 references? Please include more 	Done
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	All participants were selected fairly. An adequate, complete and understandable written consent form was approved by the respondents. Privacy of the data was highly protected and respondents had their right to ask any kinds of question regarding the research. There was written agreement with the patronizer of the research.