

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	MS_AJGR_85575
Title of the Manuscript:	Stakeholder Contribution to Rural Development in Mezam Division, Cameroon
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:

(<https://journalajgr.com/index.php/AJGR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>General comments (source: from many Journals):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It is recommend to present a paper with article structure in the style of "IMRADDC", that is 1. Introduction; 2. The Proposed Method/Algorithm/Procedure specifically designed (optional); 3. Method; 4. Results and Discussions; 5. Conclusions. 2) Part of Introduction: explain the context of the study and state the precise objective. An Introduction have to contain the following parts: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Background: Authors have to make clear what the context is. Ideally, authors should give an idea of the SoTA (State-of-The Art) of the field the report is about. b. The Problem: If there was no problem, there would be no reason for writing a manuscript, and definitely no reason for reading it. So, please tell readers why they should proceed reading. Experience shows that for this part a few lines are often sufficient. c. The Proposed Solution: Now and only now! - authors may outline the contribution of the manuscript. Here authors have to make sure readers point out what are the novel aspects of authors work. Authors should place the paper in proper context by citing relevant papers. At least, 15 references are referred in this section. Reference year should be less than 5 years from now. 3) Part of Method: the presentation of the experimental methods should be clear and complete in every detail facilitating reproducibility by other scientists. 4) Part of Results and discussion: The presentation of results should be simple and straightforward in style. This section report the most important findings, including results of statistical analyses as appropriate and comparisons to other research results. Results given in figures should not be repeated in tables. This is where the author(s) should explain in words what he/she/they discovered in the research. It should be clearly laid out and in a logical sequence. This section should be supported suitable references. 5) About Figures & Tables in your manuscript: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Because tables and figures supplement the text, all tables and figures should be referenced in the text. Authors must explain what the reader should look for when using the table or figure. Focus only on the important point the reader should draw from them, and leave the details for the reader to examine on her own. b. Tables are to be presented with single horizontal line under: the table caption, the column headings and at the end of the table. All tables are produced by creating tables in MS Word. Captured tables are NOT allowed. c. All figures must in high quality images. Use different patterns for presenting different results in your figures/graphics (instead of different colors). It is mandatory!! 6) Part of Conclusion: Summarize sentences the primary outcomes of the study in a paragraph. Are the claims in this section supported by the results, do they seem reasonable? Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research? Does the article support or contradict previous theories? Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward? 7) Most importantly, please ensure the similarity score is less than 25%. 8) Please ensure that all references have been cited in your text. Use a tool such as EndNote, Mendeley, or Zotero for reference management and formatting, and choose IEEE style. Each citation should be written in the order of appearance in the text in square brackets. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It is better if your findings are compared with the phenomenon as well as the results of studies in other similar areas. What are the similarities and differences, to confirm that your findings are true. Add the narration in the Result and Discussions. 2) It is necessary to make a justification in the form of a sentence or a statement that the number of sample representations and questionnaires in that location (which is describes in Tables 1,2, and 3) is sufficient and statistically accepted. 3) In the analysis in points 3.1 and 3.2 describe the findings. The spatial distribution findings in Figures 3 and 4 need to be explained more spatially. Do not only relate to the number of stakeholders but relate to the findings phenomenon. Explain that with the number of stakeholders who have these roles, what are the findings of the phenomenon. On what does the domination of these stakeholders scientifically mean?. 4) References need to be added. Reference year should be less than 5 years from now. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>In general, this paper is sufficient to meet the standards of geographic research. However, to be published as a scientific paper that should be referred by other researchers, it needs a slightly more spatial elaboration and explanation.</p>	

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:	Muhammad Dimyati
Department, University & Country	University of Indonesia, Indonesia