

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_91255
Title of the Manuscript:	Spatio-temporal dynamics of land use in lake ecosystems in the Sudano-Guinean zone (Adamaoua-Cameroon)
Type of the 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://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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>There is need to revisit some of the sections of the report and these are, Abstract which is too shallow and lacking tangible facts like baseline data among others, Introduction that is observed to be lacking important information for introducing the study, the problems, aim, objective etc. and the conclusions that has not been well summarised basing on the aim of the research and the findings.</p> <p>All the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols should be written in full followed by the abbreviations/acronyms themselves when they appear in the document for the first time, thereafter, the abbreviations/acronyms/symbols can be used (e.g. GHG, REDD in the third paragraph of the Introduction Section)</p> <p>Proofreading of the whole document to correct the grammar, typos etc including rephrasing/reconstruction of some sentences as well as taking out repeated statements.</p> <p>Consider adding a section on the proposed way forward to the report to address some of the challenges and observations made during the study that have been mentioned in the report.</p> <p>The conclusion part needs to be reviewed and it should be consistent with what has been provided in the whole document. It is not supposed to be a copy and paste of what is in the Results and Discussion sections but rather a summary of the findings which is also supposed to be part of the Abstract.</p> <p>Consider including references for most of the critical/crucial facts presented in the whole report. For example; first paragraph of the Introduction Section and second sentence from the top. You may wish to note that most of the facts that need references are in the Introduction Section of the report.</p> <p>Consider numbering the, Introduction, Conclusion and Reference Sections and the references. If the numbering of the sections is accepted, then the numbering of the report will have to be reviewed.</p> <p>Not all references on the list have been used in the document. Only 25 of the total 34 references as indicated in the report have been used in the document i.e. 1,2,3,5,6,9,10,13,14,15,16,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,30,31 and 34. There is a repeat on 28 and 29. In addition, 6 references used in the document are not on the list and these are; Defrance et al, 2017; Bahroum et al, 2014; Touchrd et al, 2015; Balsamo et al, 2012 and MINEF1994</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Avoid making sentences that are not connecting very well as observed in sub-section 1.3 and second paragraph. Also check on the first paragraph after the introduction of Figure 10.</p> <p>Consider re-allocating Figures/Table in the document closer to where they have been introduced in the report for easy referencing (e.g. Table 2 and 3; Figures 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,14 etc.).</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Consider avoiding the use of words like “we”, “I” “us” etc. in the whole document. In other words, avoid personalising issues in research papers.</p> <p>Consider inserting page numbers to the report for easy referencing.</p> <p>I have made a number of comments under the compulsory, few ones in minor revision as well as optional/general sections; I feel the manuscript could be under the minor revision range as most of the facts presented need to be corrected/revised if considered to be making sense by the author. All in all, the manuscript needs to be repaired basing on the deficiencies, some of which have been mentioned in addition to the track changes provided in the attached document may be of help to the author.</p> <p>It is a good study that can help in the management of the environment in general which when well administered, can help the global problem of climate change which becoming to be a threat to the present and future generations. However, there is a need to provide more details to the study and this should include the problems/challenges as well as the proposed way forward based on the experience generated from the study and other studies done in the region and beyond. No mention is made of the existing policy/policies in the country that can help the minimise the issues presented/observed.</p>	

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>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	James Peaches Phiri
Department, University & Country	Malawi