

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

Solhanlle Bonilla-Duarte¹

1 Instituto Tecnológico de Santo Domingo

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I want to congratulate the author for the topic and focus of his analysis. I find it very valuable and innovative to approach an instrument like REDD+ from a local perspective, with a specific case study and considering the multiplicity of actors and factors.

My suggestions are the following:

- 1) Methodology: It is important to better explain the methodological approach, sample, and results. The author does not provide details about the data collection and analysis process, selection criteria for interviews, type of questions, groups of respondents, and quantity.
- 2) Discussion: Consider for the discussion published research that has carried out reviews of the impact of REDD+ in communities with different approaches and methodologies. I dare to suggest the following:

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2020.102203

https://doi.org/10.31840/sya.vi22.2092

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.01.022

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2021.102249

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2018.09.012

https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-021-01618-7

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2023.102952

- 3) Literary review should be broader, contemplating the diversity of elements to be considered in the implementation of REDD+. Although in countries where degradation and deforestation are expected to be prevented and the causes may be similar, cultural, social, and political factors can establish important differences.
- 4) Governance: The article raises multiple situations that affect the characteristics of governance, which, as has been demonstrated, is vital to succeed in the management of public goods and common resources. However, it is not one of



the approaches analyzed and compared in the discussion of the results.

5) Finally, the organization of the article should be clearer so that it is understood which information is the result of fieldwork and which are conclusive statements by the author.

I understand that the article needs to consider these improvements.