

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_94202
Title of the Manuscript:	Review on Present Status of Rohingya People in Bangladesh: Effects on Social, Economic, Environment and Wildlife Habitat
Type of the Article	REVIEW

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:

(<https://www.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	All diagrams included need a reference. Please check permission rights as well.	
Minor REVISION comments	NO,	
Optional/General comments	A good review paper. All diagrams included require permission. If free rights to publish diagrams and maps are given, include this. The paper explains how population of Rohingya refugees can affect forestation and habitat. It also explains the social effects of poverty. The solution seems to be repatriation. The problem is not so simplistic and the paper looked at just one aspect. The question of displacement is an abuse of human rights. There is also the loss of belongingness or identity known in French as 'apatrides' for such people. The same problem now affects Nepal. There must be a degree of restraint and compassion regarding the displaced people. This is where the problem resides when they leave their houses and belongings and squat forests that can be dangerous for them. There is NO solution than to recognise Rohingyas and see a normalisation by giving them their rights and freedom. Myanmar's banning of such people speaks of ethnic cleansing. Technically the paper is good, Punctuation and grammar are okay. Referencing is fair but a balanced view might help. What are the counter arguments? How does the author critically review this problem from a third person's view or simply neutral view?	

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>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nirmal Kumar Betchoo
Department, University & Country	Université des Mascareignes, Mauritius