

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The manuscript is very important as it focuses on important aspects where it talks about the importance of local institutions and how synergies between central governance and local institutions is the demand of the hour in regards to sustainable approaches.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes suitable	
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.	Yes, it is ok and comprehensive. I feel few more information need to add in the abstract in regards to introducing the idea of the research paper.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes appropriate	
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.	I think the mixed methodology approach is quite acceptable comparing the nature of the paper. The manuscript was drafted with a scientific approach where the author nicely used various graphs, charts, and other information. I feel after the discussion a portion needs to be added where the author may briefly talk about major take aways or findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, but it is not organically organized. The referencing style needs to be same throughout the manuscript and author must maintain that.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it's ok	
Optional/General comments	The paper may be accepted for further process and publication and necessary modification can be done	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Santanu Bhowmick
Department, University & Country	India

Review Form 3