

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_95637
Title of the Manuscript:	Managing environmental destruction/degradation using traditional, cultural, spiritual traps: the tale of the Dagaaba and Birifor
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes, because it proposes to present an alternative to the protection of the environment beyond legal norms.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? Partially. I suggest: Alternative for managing environmental destruction/degradation using traditional, cultural and spiritual traps: the tale of Dagaaba and Birifor</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Partially. I suggest restructuring with the data present in the article, to later be better analyzed and discussed, based on the specialized literature.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Partially. The author makes a good presentation of the methodology. However, I believe that the text is still too descriptive. I imagine that it will be able to contribute to Science if the author presents successful experiences of how the Dagaaba and Birifor peoples contributed to the conservation/protection of the ecosystem with their cultural system. In addition, it should standardize the way in which literature is cited, in addition to restructuring the text.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. Partially. Although it brought current texts, I suggest that the author include much more specialized literature in the part of the discussion of the presented data.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Partially.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Congratulations on the search. The topic is interesting, and I believe it has strong potential for improvement.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Celso Maran de Oliveira
Department, University & Country	Federal University of São Carlos, Brazil