



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_60388
Title of the Manuscript:	Considerations on the Philatelic Testimony of the Maramureş Mining Activity (I)
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Introduction (n. 1), material and methods (n. 2), and conclusion (4) could be revised for a better presentation. The findings discussed as the 'results and discussion' (n. 3) are very informative, particularly for foreign readers. This part informs the readers about the richness of the Maramures County with the ups and downs of the philatelic movement since its inception in the beginning of the last century. To me, the data presented in this part is/are quite impressive.</p> <p><u>Introduction</u> (n. 1) is expected to present the nature of the problem that the writer would like to address or the problem to be solved. The readers are mostly expecting that the introduction will shows the "why" of the topic, e.g. why the philatelic movement is so important for the Mining Activity and/or for the history of the Maramures county. Or, philatelic movement might be much more than just a hobby among the young generation of the times, but a love of beauty, of human creativity or of aestheticism. Secondly, the purpose of the article or the intention of the writer should be articulated in this part as well. It is worthwhile that the writer mentions his/her intention to "pay tribute to the forerunners...". Unfortunately, it is mentioned in the next part (n. 2). 'Introduction' is also expected to highlight the relevance of the study.</p> <p><u>Materials and methods</u> (n. 2) should include information about how the writer copes with the problem mentioned in the</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>previous part (n. 1); what the writer will do with regard to the procedures, approach, assumptions, materials used, etc. I guess the sub-heading would be enough 'methods', instead of 'materials and methods'.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> (n. 4) could be revised a bit. The writer should explain the meaning of the findings (n. 3) for the Maramures county in particular and for the philatelists in general. I think the last sentence in the conclusion is quite good. If we formulate in another way, the writer would express the limitations of the study and seems to expect collaboration with other scholars for a possible future research. In principle, the conclusion relates back to the problem and purpose mentioned in the introduction (n. 1). And, the readers also expect what the results and discussion (n. 3) precisely mean in responding the problem.</p> <p>The <u>abstract</u> could also be made better. The writer should avoid to copy-paste the sentence(s) in the introduction. The ideas or main points of the abstract should be taken from the introduction as well as from the conclusion. Basically the abstract mentions the problem which the writer is trying to solve. The writer should also underline the purpose of the study and/or the motivation that has incited him/her to make the study/research. And, the abstract also incorporates the method of the study/research, namely, how the writer has gone about achieving the objective.</p> <p>I am convinced that the writer could revise the article quite easily, since it is just of minor revision.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Raymundus I Made Sudhiarsa</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>"Widya Sasana" School of Philosophy and Theology, Indonesia</i>