

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_93767
Title of the Manuscript:	Chad-Cameroon oil pipeline: the socioeconomic and environmental issues for local residents
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:

(<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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The study has potential for publication, but in the course of the article I make some recommendations in order to improve the work.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Introduction This section is fine, but I suggest informing the objective after the problem question. Specifically because the objective is formulated based on the problem, not problem based on the objective.</p> <p>Methodology It was not clear the analysis of your data. How did you analyze your data? What were the types of tests performed? Science and the reader need to be clear about what resulted in their research.</p> <p>Results And Discussion This section does not present the state of the art and/or validation of your data. I identified only analysis of results, but there are no literatures to support your data. While evaluating your data, you must validate it. I suggest rearranging this section.</p> <p>Conclusion You do not need to present objective in this section. Do not forget that here you must demonstrate the conclusion of your study, without doubt or uncertainty. I suggest reorganizing clearly and objectively the conclusion of your study.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Josimar da Silva Freitas
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Amapá, Brazil