Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_SAJSSE_86376**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Towards a sustainable China-Africa forest trade; an assessment of environmental implications for FOCAC members**
Type of the 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	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 Coperation (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 emmisions 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 CO_2 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 CO_2 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.	
Minor REVISION comments	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".	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Khozema Bin Ahmed Ali**
Department, University & Country	**School of Industrial Technology, University of Science, Malaysia**