

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_102452
Title of the Manuscript:	CITIZENS SCIENCE PERSPECTIVES ON DRIVERS OF SEDIMENTATION IN THE LUSITU RIVER CATCHMENT IN SIAVONGA DISTRICT, ZAMBIA
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.journaljgeesi.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>The article submitted for review is in a certain sense unique, since the material presented in it is not based on scientific research, but describes the opinion of people who live in the studied territories. That is why the title of the article submitted for review is so original.</p> <p>The title of the article suitable</p> <p>The abstract of the article comprehensive</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate</p> <p>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references sufficient and recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In my opinion, when preparing the final version of the article for publication, an addition should be made in the text regarding which class of the country's population these studies were conducted. This is necessary in order to assess the level of education and thinking of the social sample.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yakov G. Verkhivker
Department, University & Country	Odessa National University of Technology, Ukraine