



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Zoology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_65164
Title of the Manuscript:	Philately's Implications in Ecological Education via Romanian Thematic Joint Issues (V) - regarding the 3rd collaboration with WWF
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> )

**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	The article is good but does not fit in the main stream article content. There is no obvious link between Philately and the ecological education. One can ask has the conservation status of the said fish improved? What has the WWF stamps yielded to the fish status?	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	You can publish the article as notes and not as a research article because I do not see the linkage with research	

**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)	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Stanford Siachoono
Department, University & Country	Copperbelt University, Zambia