

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>)

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>Introduction: There are several cases of poor citations, where statistics and statements of certainty are given and made without any reference.</p> <p>Study Area: The letterings in Fig 1 are too small. Increase the font size of the lettering to improve on the visibility and readability of the place names.</p> <p>Data Collection: The sampling technique(s) adopted by the author(s) was not stated. It was therefore not clear how the various actors or stakeholders that the questionnaire was administered to were chosen. Also, the classification of the various actors was not distinct. For example, an educationist or health worker could be a man or woman or youth. Furthermore, what informed the number of questionnaire administered to each group of actors?</p> <p>Acronyms should be defined in the first instance (VDAs, CIGs).</p> <p>Since the interviews were structured, it would be appropriate to state some of the items in the interview.</p> <p>Specify the nature of the secondary data obtained from the secondary sources mentioned and where they were presented in the work. Literature should not be confused with secondary data.</p> <p>Results and Discussions: 's' should be deleted from discussions.</p> <p>The discussion of the results didn't reference any past studies, whether the findings in this study contradicts or in agreement. The discussion of the results should be revisited.</p> <p>Proper proof reading should be carried out as there are evidences of poor sentence structure, typo and grammatical errors.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Title: I suggests the words "Stakeholder and Contribution" should be in plural (Stakeholders' Contributions).</p> <p>Abstract: The abstract should be reduced to 250 words maximum. Acronyms should be defined in their first usage (e.g. CBO; NGO)</p> <p>Introduction: Line 26: You don't start a sentence with reference number.</p> <p>Figure 7: This should be "Plate 1". Photographs are plates not figures. Please, change others</p> <p>References: Insufficient journal article references.</p>	
Optional/General comments	The Methodology and discussion of findings should be revisited to close the existing gaps identified.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Odafivwotu Ohwo
Department, University & Country	Niger Delta University, Nigeria