

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.journaligeesi.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>	<p>1. Yes. Gives advice on the use of land with different land-scapes.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. The abstract is okay. However, the author can consider: i. locating the area of study, e.g. latitudes and longitudes, ii. Talking about the total number of samples collected/questionnaires received.</p> <p>4. Yes. For results section, since the author has given results and explained, I would suggest it be RESULTS and DISCUSSION. The wordings in red should move to introduction.</p> <p>5. Yes, it is correct.</p> <p>6. A part from the 1970 reference, all others are recent. The author can still consider changing references as suggested in red in reference section. Reference in red not easily understood.</p> <p>The paper looks good. Re-arrangement as suggested will make it flow. For figure 2, 'Characteristics of the are', I don't think the word characteristic is best for describing this. Figure 3, 'ot often', I think should be 'Not often'. Figures 3 and 5 and highlighted words in yellow are repeated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Good English	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Willis O. Aguko
Department, University & Country	Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya