

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_125945
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Multiple Drivers Influencing Residents' Perception of Ecotourism in a Biodiversity Rich Forest Protected Area of Bangladesh</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article is important so far as it focuses on the best conditions for practicing ecotourism. Indeed, ecotourism aims to be respectful of the natural and human environment, so it makes conservation profitable without harming the natural environment, unlike mass tourism.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is appropriate	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Before the last sentence of the summary, it was important to mention some negative consequences of ecotourism. Indeed, proposing to you: "Policy makers and forest department's officials should undertake necessary actions to solve the negative impacts of ecotourism.", without listing some of the negative consequences.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is appropriate, however, there are too many subtitles in the "2. MATERIALS AND METHODS" section, so much so that the titles overlap: "2.4 Evaluation of the impact items" must be in the title "2.8 Data Analysis" The titles "2.5 Selection of Respondents" and "2.7 Secondary Data Collection" must be in the title "2.6 Data Collection"	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is not scientifically robust, the results have not been discussed at all and compared to those of other authors. There is no reference in part "3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION". Furthermore, it would be better to talk about tourism and not ecotourism, given its consequences.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Poor reference. he will need a reference to discuss his work	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The map in "fig 1" is not precise, no scale, no legend, it is difficult to appreciate what the author is showing us.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kely Male Roger</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé, Côte d'Ivoire</b>