



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ ARJASS_48592</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Environmental Movement and the Conservation of Forest: a Case Study on Ratargul Swamp Forest of Sylhet, Bangladesh</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short research paper</b>

**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**

	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><b>ABSTRACT</b> Total restricted by this reviewer to align it to other sections of the paper. – see accompanied edited manuscript.</p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b> Total restricted by this reviewer to align it to other sections of the paper. – see accompanied edited manuscript.</p> <p><b>METHODOLOGY</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Ethical considerations - People were interviewed! The ethical issues (consent and Ethical clearance of study by hosting institution) regarding intellectual property has not been addressed in this paper!</li><li>2. Study population - Info on villages of no value if not included in this study</li><li>3. "However, inhabitants of Ratargul village were selected as the research population." [Indicate why this specific village was selected] [Indicate socio-economic status/condition of this village.]</li><li>4. Methods and tools of data collection: - "Forty seven respondents were selected for the primary data collection. They were selected by using stratified random sampling on the basis of their level of involvement. Data were has been collected via from the local people and environmental groups and from the forest department. Key informant interview, semi-structured interview schedules, case study investigations [explain], focus group discussions [explain] and archival research [explain]."</li><li>5. "Further key informants included environmentalists of various organizations [indicate the various themes explored with these key informants], government employees [indicate the various themes explored with these key informants], and academics [indicate the various themes explored with these key informants]."</li><li>6. For additional issues see accompanied edited manuscript.</li></ol> <p><b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>7. See the sequence of the key informants questioned and the themes explored - presented in the methodology – that same sequence should be repeated here in this section! Currently, there is no alignment between these 2 sections. Thus the results/discussion should be reformulated, to cover all parts of the methodology in the correct sequence. The above historical information needs to be relocated to and incorporated into the Introduction – this reviewer has relocated it.</li><li>8. Heading: Organizations, Forms, Strategies and Process of the Movement - 4 paragraphs need to be formulated via the heading above and focus on: Paragraph 1: Organizations of the movement Paragraph 2: Forms of the movement Paragraph 3: Strategies of the movement Paragraph 4: Process of the movement</li><li>9. "These slogans express the sincere earnest request to the people to save the environment of Ratargul swamp forest" – this statement is biased. Biasness not allowed in a scientific paper.</li><li>10. Heading: Reactions and Negotiations - 2 paragraphs need to be formulated via the heading above and focus on: Paragraph 1: Reactions of the movement Paragraph 2: Negotiations with of the movement</li><li>11. For additional issues see accompanied edited manuscript.</li></ol>	Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Very poorly written. Structure needs serious attention to align the various parts of the paper to one another.	Tried to improve

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> YES. Ethical considerations People were interviewed! The ethical issues (consent and Ethical clearance of study by hosting institution) regarding intellectual property has not been addressed in this paper!	Added. 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.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Anonymous Reviewer, Reviewer preferred to be anonymous.</b>
Department, University & Country	