



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_58387
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing and Conservation of Ecosystem through Philatelic Education in Europe: Think Green concept (IV) - FDCs research study
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



[SDI 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	<p>First of all, I congratulate you for the manuscript and for the curious and interesting work, which demonstrates that the theme of conservation and socio-environmental education is essential and has been taking on proportions in several habitats. The text respects the English spelling and quality standards.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The manuscripts have as strengths, a sufficiently robust and technically solid socioenvironmental observation, enabling a very interesting scientific dissemination strategy, which brings a beneficial process of scientific communication to society in the long run and touches essential environmental issues for our generation.</p> <p>However, thinking about the publication aspects of the magazine, I have some comments that can help in structuring the work.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>1. Introduction: In the historical view, who are the authors who already have this debate? I believe that it would be interesting to also retrieve bibliographical works on philatelic educators, or even important collectors, that can add a lot to the material already collected. I would like to think about the construction of philatelic thematic education, in addition to the construction of only a visual discourse but as a pedagogy, as a trajectory of concept formation, for example the concept of 'Think green' that could also be interesting in the description of the appropriate images and teaching methodology.</p> <p>2. Material and methods: In scientific work it is important to bring the references of the materials and their methodology used. Intuition is a necessary process in the training of researchers, but in terms of material and methods, I believe it is important to comment on the process of choosing the materials and data consulted, to justify the veracity of the sources. Therefore, it is also a method that can be observed in the work for scientific dissemination and improvements in the deepening of the study on philatelic education, consistent with the research being carried out.</p> <p>3. Results and discussion: The document received in pdf compromised the images and the formatting of the tables, resuming the formatting of the material. * General comment, working on the design of the images centered on the tables, respecting the limits and following a pattern, the work has a very good graphic potential, preserving the quality of the images and their formatting.</p> <p>Table 1 Italy 1, cannot be viewed. Table 2 Italy -5, cannot be viewed. Table 3. Kazakhstan -2, cannot be viewed Table 4. Latvia, it is not possible to view.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Table 5. Lichtenstein -4, cannot be viewed</p> <p>4. Conclusion: I emphasize the importance of bringing the references and the material construction of the discussions and the 'turning point' of philatelic education, and that this may reinforce future scientific work as well as bringing social habits to a socio-environmental study.</p>	
--	--	--

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gabriel Machado Araujo
Department, University & Country	Federal University of ABC, Brazil