

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_120865
Title of the Manuscript:	Geotechnical Assessment of Seismic Vulnerability in the Built Environment of Fako Division, South West Region-Cameroon
Type of the Article	Research

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community due to its comprehensive exploration of Mount Cameroon's geological and geotechnical characteristics. It provides crucial insights into volcanic hazards, soil properties, and seismic vulnerabilities, which are essential for disaster risk reduction and urban planning in volcanic regions. I appreciate the manuscript for its thoroughness in data collection and analysis, offering a detailed understanding of the complex interplay between geology, soil behavior, and seismic activity. The study's findings not only contribute to the academic understanding of volcanic landscapes but also provide practical implications for ensuring resilient infrastructure and community safety in volcanic environments.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is well-structured and informative, offering valuable insights into the research.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure ensures clarity and comprehensiveness, making it an informative and valuable contribution to the field.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound?Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its thorough geological characterization of Mount Cameroon. It meticulously documents a wide array of volcanic deposits, including lahars, basaltic lava flows, and scoria cones, supported by detailed descriptions and geological maps. The use of quantitative data values across multiple localities provides a solid foundation for assessing soil properties and susceptibility to seismic hazards. The incorporation of historical seismic intensity data from past eruptions enhances the manuscript's credibility in understanding the region's geological and seismic dynamics. These methodical approaches underscore the scientific rigor and technical depth, contributing significantly to this research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references are ok, but need to add more newer (more after 2020 year)	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article is well-written, demonstrating high scientific rigor and clarity throughout. The results presented are of significant importance, providing a detailed exploration of Mount Cameroon's diverse geological landscape, geotechnical properties, and seismic vulnerabilities. The study's comprehensive approach not only enhances our understanding of volcanic environments but also offers practical insights for infrastructure development and disaster risk reduction strategies. The future vision outlined in the manuscript suggests promising avenues for interdisciplinary research, emphasizing the need for ongoing monitoring and preparedness in volcanic regions worldwide.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></p>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Tihomir Dovramadjiev</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Technical University of Varna, Bulgaria</p>