

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_103779
Title of the Manuscript:	POPULATION MITIGATION STRATEGIES TO GEOMORPHIC HAZARDS IN LIMBE WEST COAST, SOUTH WEST REGION OF 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.journalgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important. 2. The title is suitable for the article. 3. Although averagely written, the abstract does not, in some instances reflect the title of the manuscript. 4. The subsections are not appropriate in some areas. Some sections of the Material and Methods section are in the introduction section. The introduction itself is too skeletal and does lacks scientific soundness. There is also inadequate use of existing literature in this regard. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, a lot of editing needs to be done. After this has been done, the article will still undergo review process. 6. The references are not sufficient. The author should do in-dept research. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>A lot of grammatical errors, syntax errors, use of wrong words and in some cases, very long winding sentences.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author needs to review all the Figures throughout the manuscript. Figures are used without accompanying description of the Y and X axes. Thus, difficult to interpret at first glance. The map must be properly cited and phot plates must be commented below in <i>italics</i>. Most titles of sub sections do not reflect the results presented. Thorough editing must be done before the article can be considered.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Efuetlancha Ernest Nkemele
Department, University & Country	University of Dschang, Cameroon