

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_129592
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Review of the Effectiveness of the Sierra Leone Mining Policies in Sustainable Environmental Management</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

#### **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: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The importance of the phenomenon is undeniable. The manuscript is methodologically fully adapted to the comparative legal analysis of normative solutions of ecological importance in several countries and different legal systems. This work represents an excellent example of an eclectic approach in the research of causal links between problems and solutions, theory and practice, nominal and real effectiveness of legal norms, as well as a very specific relationship of reciprocity between the legal and ecological spheres of social life. From a scientific point of view, the author has successfully reconciled all the mentioned aspects of the researched phenomenon.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is quite adequate because it fully refers to the content of the work.	
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.	The abstract of the paper represents a very clear roadmap used by the author to describe all relevant segments of his research.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Having in mind topicality, comprehensiveness and originality, the manuscript significantly contributes to scientific development in the field of both law and ecology.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The cited literature is in all respects adequate and correct. Its additional qualities represent selectivity and topicality.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The paper is written in clear English, which is suitable in a good way for scholarly communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This work is very significant because of the multidisciplinary approach to the research subject, which the author achieved through a comprehensive analysis of the entire spectrum of its legal and ecological aspects.  No, the plagiarism is not suspected in this manuscript. No, there are not any competing issues in this manuscript. No, there are not any ethical issues in this manuscript.	

#### 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:	Sergej Uljanov
Department, University & Country	University "Union – Nikola Tesla" in Belgr, The Republic of Serbia