

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_98261
Title of the Manuscript:	Agroforestry Systems on Brazilian Legal Protected Lands: Permanent Preservation Areas (PPA) and Legal Reservation Areas (LRA)
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://journalajgr.com/index.php/AJGR/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 <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Abstract should be revised in order to be synthesized and make it so concise. 4. No at all. Sections of material and method, results and discussions are not clearly appeared in the manuscript. 5. No, because of the lack of defined methodology 6. No at all. Some of references are not suitable in accordance with the context of the study. That is why it is important to rebuild the references. 7/ The conclusion need to be completed by resuming the main objective carried out in this paper.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The whole manuscript should be revised according the guidelines of the journal.</li> <li>- The author should reduce the length of the abstract in order to make it so concise.</li> <li>- The manuscript should respect the universal scientific method known by researchers; the IMRED method(Introduction – Material and method – Results and Discussions)</li> <li>- The author should withdraw those authors names underlined in the manuscript</li> </ul>	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Frederic Chamberlin Lounang Tchatchouang</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Yaoundé I, Cameroon</b>