

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_95637
Title of the Manuscript:	Managing environmental degradation using traditional, cultural, and spiritual strategies: The tale of 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Title:</p> <p>-Why traps, instead of approaches or strategies? I humbly suggest the authors consider substituting traps with any of the suggested synonyms.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>-The introduction or background could be enriched by referring to some theories and drivers introduced in this current study (Sarfo et al. 2022) to the current literature, especially in the context of Ghana:</p> <p>-Sarfo, I., Shuoben, B., Beibei, L. <i>et al.</i> (2022). Spatiotemporal development of land use systems, influences and climate variability in Southwestern Ghana (1970–2020). <i>Environ Dev Sustain</i> 24, 9851–9883 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01848-5</p> <p>Or</p> <p>-Sarfo, I., Shuoben, B., Otchwemah, H.B. <i>et al.</i> Validating local drivers influencing land use cover change in Southwestern Ghana: a mixed-method approach. <i>Environ Earth Sci</i> 81, 367 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-022-10481-y</p> <p>Lines 81-104:</p> <p>-It is important for the authors to highlight research progress (i.e., what is known and what's unknown but important to be studied that is driving the current research objective or aim) clearly from a global perspective, which will then be narrowed down to the study area. This could make readers appreciate the difference or consistency in results, especially in the discussion section when authors compare results to existing literature. Here, findings of other studies in different countries or regions with similar scope could be briefly integrated in the introduction.</p> <p>-The main aim or specific objectives or perhaps, what this study sought to address or achieve must be clearly highlighted in the last paragraph of the introduction briefly/succinctly.</p> <p>-The study's significance or contribution must also be stated or highlighted clearly in the last paragraph or last but one paragraph of the introductory section.</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <p>-Lines 106-121: Extra or additional details which are not so relevant to the study must be omitted or removed for brevity and conciseness.</p> <p>-Lines 119-122: Authors need to justify briefly and exhaust these subjective approaches.</p> <p>-Where and how was the primary data collected or generated?</p> <p>-Was there a survey or interview?</p> <p>-How many people were engaged?</p> <p>-Who were the target population?</p> <p>-How representative is the sample size or people engaged that can be used to draw general conclusions, as stipulated in this study?</p> <p>-Were the data subjected to content analysis?</p> <p>-What data analysis techniques were used? Authors stating narration is not enough. How were the primary data analyzed or processed?</p> <p>-The study area or selected regions could be explained and backed by maps.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>-Did authors consider ethics (i.e., sought for permission for instance) when visiting these sites to take pictures of some heritage or cultural sites?</p> <p>-Any limitations or challenges encountered during the course of the study? Do these limitations or challenges affect the results in anyway?</p> <p>More details are needed to substantiate or enhance the methodology section. Restructuring/re-organisation of the study area and methodology section is needed.</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>-Scientific papers are designed to culminate or have these sections: Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods or Methodology, Results, Discussion and Conclusion...followed by references, acknowledgements, conflict of interest, funding sources, appendix and so on.</p> <p>-Authors failed to highlight clearly what the results of this study are. The results must be ordered or structured based on the study objectives. This is an original research article; hence, must be structured as such. Results section must be briefly introduced, followed by the results of the study clearly presented in an orderly manner.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>-Here, the results presented in the previous section are explained or digested in 4-6 paragraphs.</p> <p>-Comparison of the study results against existing literature or other studies are done in this section.</p> <p>-What was observed at the sites based on the observation approach/technique, what does the author (s) make of the traditional/cultural strategies from a neutral perspective?</p> <p>-How does these strategies influence sustainability of natural resources in the region or area, and in what way do they go a long way to augment socio-economic, political and environmental strategies?</p> <p>-Do the study results agree, support or refute the results of other studies conducted elsewhere? If so, why the difference in results. If they agree with other studies, they must be stated and backed by those references accordingly.</p> <p>-What is the way forward? Does the people uphold these values and wish to sustain it or westernization is changing trends that could make the people lose these cultural or environmental strategies used in conserving natural resources?</p> <p>-What are the drivers driving change in the area or negatively/positively influencing these cultural/spiritual strategies? Each paragraph in the discussion section must be tailored to discuss an objective or key parameter.</p> <p>***What is currently presented here currently as results are clearly empty or not enough of studies of this nature.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>-The concluding section must briefly restate the main aim of the study and summarize the key findings either in bulletin or in a paragraph.</p> <p>-The summarized findings should then be followed by the significance of the study, gaps and study limitations that could potentially drive or propel future studies briefly.</p> <p>-Authors should kindly note that aspects of less relevance must be removed except those that were discovered or are linked to the current study must be included.</p>	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	References: -Authors should kindly revise and ensure that the correct format and order are adhered to. Other comments: -Major grammatical defects and syntax errors were identified through the manuscript. Moderate were revised or corrected. I humbly suggest the authors revise the manuscript thoroughly before re-submission. They can seek the assistance of someone with command over English to improve the proficiency level of the paper.	
Optional/General comments	The scope of this research is interesting and could influence policy and the management/regulation of resources/activities in the study area and Ghana at large. However, the manuscript in its current state is far from being ready for publication. There are some major concerns which the authors need to address to enhance the scientific robustness, overall structure and proficiency level of the paper prior to acceptance. Authors should carefully consider comments raised to improve the manuscript.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Isaac Sarfo
Department, University & Country	Research Institute for History of Science and Technology, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, China