

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_101674
Title of the Manuscript:	Land use conflicts and planning implications: Insights from Kumbo, 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- No, the manuscript is not really important for scientific community.</p> <p>2-The title is only partially appropriate because the author does not actually present the implications in the text as advertised in the title. The title can be simply stated "Land use conflicts in Kumbo, North West Cameroon"</p> <p>2- The abstract is a little bit comprehensive. But the aspects "land use conflict dynamics and their planning implications" announced in the abstract are almost absent in the body of the text.</p> <p>3- Subsection and structure are acceptable. Just acceptable because it is not really aligned with what was announced in the abstract ant at the end of the introduction</p> <p>4- Just average</p> <p>5- Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. The author cited many references. but, we believe that by exploring the references in the field of urban planning, he could further enrich his work. By exploring French-speaking literature, it can also enrich the work</p> <p>For other remarks, please, see the notes on manuscript</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language is suitable for scholarly communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>-Some aspects of the methodology require clarification (sample size, survey unit for administering the questionnaire, etc.)</p> <p>-The literature review (the state of knowledge) is of an average level</p> <p>-The conceptual framework is lacking</p> <p>Basically, the work lacks a bit of consistency</p>	

Comment [LD1]: we do not really see this aspect in the manuscript

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Defo Louis
Department, University & Country	University of Yaoundé I, Cameroon