

## 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	

### 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 REVISION</b> 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. Manuscripts are quite important in the development of scientific community  2. Yes, ok  3. Abstract is too long, it needs to be shortened again directly to the point  4. Subsections and the structure of the manuscript should follow the rules of scientific writing that apply. There are too many subsections, the conclusion should be focused and concise  5. The structure of the manuscript meets scientific principles, it's just that for the format, make sure it complies with the provisions of the publisher  6. References should be up-to-date and 75% primary literature	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Enough, it's just that in writing it should be one paragraph more than one sentence	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Writing and editing are tidied up again, the format and writing structure make sure they are appropriate.	

### 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Reny Sukmawani
Department, University & Country	Universitas Muhammadiyah Sukabumi, Indonesia