

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_83780
Title of the Manuscript:	The Concept Of Forest Management Based On Customary Forest Law In North Aceh Regency
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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The standard <b>abstract</b> definition for a research paper is "An abstract is a short statement about your paper designed to give the reader a complete, yet concise, understanding of your paper's research and findings. It is a mini-version of your paper." Therefore, abstract should be a summary of the research paper in one paragraph. A good abstract should be in one paragraph and should not exceed 250 words. Author should follow a standard format. Reviewers argument to authors, "Rewrite the Abstract"</p> <p>In the results and discussion parts it is obvious to discuss about findings from the research. There should be tables, figures, graphs or formulas to describe the findings. There are standard formats and guidelines available to formulate <b>Result and discussion</b> section of a research paper. The <b>literature review</b> section is not similar to <b>Result and discussion</b>. In this manuscript, The Result and Discussion section is likely to Literature review section and therefore confusing. Authors should take care and concern about the dilemma.</p> <p>Study area should be located by Mapping. General reader would be wondered where the research location is and how the area interpret. Reviewers argument to authors " Please provide Map or pictures of the study location"</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Full of the manuscript is tiring and hard to read without any graphical or pictorial presentation.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**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>Mithila Parvin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bangladesh</b>