**Response to Editorial Comments**

**Manuscript Title**: *Credit and Forestry Cooperatives in Bulgaria: Historical Development, Economic Rule and Legal Framework ("Credit and Forestry Cooperatives in Bulgaria: Historical Development, Economic Rule and Legal Framework and their contribution to sustainable development of rural and forestry regions")*

**Manuscript ID**: SAJSSE\_138491

Dear Editors,

We appreciate the time and effort invested in reviewing our manuscript. Below we address each of the editorial comments with specific actions taken to improve the paper:

| **Editor’s Comment** | **Authors’ Response** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. *This manuscript is a good attempt but fails to make any contribution to the field. It’s just a descriptive paper that lacks any proper sequence, ROL, methodology.* | We have restructured the manuscript to include a clearer research objective and a more analytical “Results and Discussion” section. Key contributions are now emphasized. |
| 2. *The study focuses on the contribution of credit co-operatives to sustainable development of rural and forestry areas in Bulgaria, which should be reflected in the title.* | The title has been revised to: **"Credit and Forestry Cooperatives in Bulgaria: Historical Development, Economic Rule and Legal Framework and their contribution to sustainable development of rural and forestry regions"** – highlighting their role in sustainable rural and forestry development. |
| 3. *Abstract is very short and fails to give a proper snapshot of the background of study, research methodology, findings & conclusion.* | The abstract has been rewritten to provide a concise overview of the study’s background, methodology, key findings, and policy recommendations. |
| 4. *The manuscript is not scientific and does not follow research structure.* | The revised version now follows a conventional scientific structure, including: Abstract, Introduction, Material and Methods, Results and Discussion, Conclusion, and References. |
| 5. *The manuscript lacks proper references.* | The revised manuscript includes 27 relevant academic and legislative references, including historical and contemporary sources, EU regulations, and reports from FAO, COGECA, WOCCU and the European Commission. |
| 6. *The language is ok but the content lacks significance.* | While we acknowledge this concern, we believe the expanded analysis, clarified contributions, and newly added policy implications in the discussion and conclusion strengthen the scientific significance of the paper. |

We trust that the current version of the manuscript now meets the expected academic and editorial standards of the journal.

Sincerely,
*The Author*