

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_86376
Title of the Manuscript:	Towards a sustainable China-Africa forest trade; an assessment of environmental implications for FOCAC members
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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There is no authors name or affiliations. This is very important information the authors need to add after the title of the manuscript.2. What does the authors mean by this sentence "Resource for aid or otherwise Characteristics most of Africa trade relationships.". The authors should rephrase this sentence so that the meaning could be understood by the reader.3. For the abbreviation, there is no need to define a term every time it is used. For example, "Forum on China Africa Cooperation (FOCAC)". On the next use of this term, the authors can just use the abbreviation.4. The authors need to improve section 1.1. The authors mentioned "Both previous and current literature focusing on trade and CO2 emissions has focused on testing three main hypotheses; the Pollution haven[6] and pollution halo[7] as the theoretical basis as a result we analyse the findings, contrasting results, arguments and recommendations as a basis for this current study". What are the three hypotheses? The authors only mention two here. The authors should also rephrase the sentence on how will the hypotheses be related to their current work.5. The authors mentioned "The average CO2 is 0.0163". What is the 0.0163 value? It is the amount of CO₂ in billion?6. In this sentence "Nevertheless, from table 4, there is no evidence (0.33) of the relationship between forest product exports from the selected 20 FOCAC states.", what relationship is the authors referring to?7. For Figure 1, the authors need to add a label for the y-axis on the right so that the reader can identify which y-axis for CO₂ emission and which y-axis is for forest export.8. For Figure 2, the authors need to add a label for the y-axis on the right too.9. Throughout the manuscript, there are several grammatical errors. It is recommended that the authors send this manuscript for proof reading. It would significantly improve the quality of the manuscript.	<p>We thank the reviewer for such important comments and valuable suggestion. We agree that these suggestions will help improve the quality of the manuscript.</p> <p>As a result we have carefully reviewed the manuscript and amended all correction as suggested by the reviewer. All correction have been highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>Specifically the responses are as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. We have included all the names and affiliation of the authors as requested.2. In the abstract section we have also change the confusion sentence to help simplify the understanding of readers.3. The repetition of the definition of the term FOCAC has been revised.4. In section 1.1 we wrote three instead of two. This was a typo therefore we have corrected it. We used hypothesis (Halo and Haven hypothesis as theoretical lenses)5. In the discussion section we have omitted the value of CO₂. However it has been mention in the data description section in the methods section. The unit of CO₂ is in Billion tons. The correction has been done accordingly.6. From table 4 we have not indicated the relationship been discussed. In principle we are referring to the main determinants (FOREST PRODUCTS EXPORTS AND CO₂ EMISSION). The corrections have been done.7. The omission of the Y-axis label in Figure 1 has been done.8. The omission of the Y-axis label in Figure 2 has been amended accordingly.9. We have noticed the typos and errors. The manuscript has been revised and proof read by a native speaker.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The authors should be consistent in the using and writing the reference. For example, in this sentence the author wrote "Singhania & Saini, (2021) also showed evidence of" and in another sentence, the authors wrote "Similarly [9], [11], revealed that,"2. The authors need to be consistent in the "figure" term. In the figure caption, the authors use the term "Figure" but in the text the authors use the term "fig" and "Figure".	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Thank you for the suggestion. We originally employ the IEEE numbering system of reference due to this all APA styles have been changed into numbering system.2. With regards to figures and fig, we have resorted to use figure in both the main text and caption. Thank You.
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	We agree with all the comments suggested by reviewer. In response we have done all the corrections and have highlighted with yellow in the manuscript.