

# Review of: "“Saving the Forest” with a REDD+ Project: Socio-Ecological Repercussions on Indigenous People in Cambodia"

Phasy Res<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Université Panthéon-Sorbonne (Paris I)

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

There are a lot of valid points you make in the article. However, firstly, I am not sure that all these points could fit into one article. Secondly, as I read through the bullet points in each topic, I keep asking how and why? Explain more with concrete evidence. For example, in Theme 3 - "Complicity and sometimes corruption are noted, with the conservation NGO, national/local authorities, and external agencies (audit, consultants, brokers, carbon certifiers...) suspected of exaggeratedly gratifying the REDD+, therefore prioritizing their agenda over ethical considerations". I need you to show me how this is happening, not just make a statement like that. If possible, please show me how it happens in each bullet point of your findings. When I read an article, it is important for me to know how the author came up with the particular finding (e.g., was it by talking to people or by observation, and on what occasion). Most of the time, the reader is left out of this part and just gets a general paragraph about how the information was gathered in the methodology section, which I think is not enough.