

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_122216
Title of the Manuscript:	Interaction Between Local Institutions in a Context of Centralized Governance of the Nazinga Game Ranch (NGG), Centre-Sud Region of Burkina Faso
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>On another note, it is significant to the scientific community in providing a distinctive comparative analysis of structural and direct violence against Pakistani and Korean women. It adds valuable empirical depth to extant research on the effects of cultural attitudes and legal frameworks on gender-based violence. I like that the manuscript covers a lot, but because of this perhaps more evidence could easily improve its depth.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>In order to better understand how local institutions interact in the administration of Burkina Faso's Nazinga Game Ranch (NGR), this research looks at the dynamics of conflict, cooperation, and apathy among stakeholders. These dynamics have an influence on the sustainable management of this protected area.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is fairly complete, mentioning various components of the study like local institutional-governance related interactions and their role in sustainable management. But it can be made better by giving a small touch of the methodology and some basic/conclusion results. Adding these would make the research broader and more informative.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate if they logically build upon the research objectives, remain relevant to the central theme, and provide clear and detailed coverage of the study's components.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>With a strict methodology and independent statistics being used, the manuscript presents good scientific quality in addition to offering sound technical features. Background use of only recent data and a clear research question will ensure its relevance, validity The comprehensive and critical review of the literature, as well a consideration of theoretical shortcomings contribute to additional academic value.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references cited in the paper are mostly well written and provide a good background for performing this research. Nevertheless, it includes no new recent studies or sources that might enrich the analysis even more. Because publications can lag behind new discoveries — even more so when it comes to book-length treatment of important topics that have been widely studied in the research literature before anyone writes about them at length — I suggest adding a few from these past couple years if they are on topically orders things, or face emergent factors within the field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications, with clear and precise expression of complex ideas. However, minor revisions for clarity and consistency may enhance the manuscript's readability and overall quality.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdul Qayyum
Department, University & Country	Lincoln University, Malaysia