

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_113246
Title of the Manuscript:	Dynamics and Policies: Assessing the impact of Population in Kenya
Type of the Article	Review Article

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. There are sufficient merits.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable, however the work 'impact' tends to imply a physical collision. It may be better to use something as 'Assessing the Influence of Governmental Policies on the Dynamics of the Population of Kenya'</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes, but I have a problem with references primarily listed at the end of the paragraphs (mostly later in the manuscript). They should be directly attributed to the statements they represent.</p>	<p>Have improved everything</p> <p>Title have been changed</p> <p>This has been changed as well</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The use of language is sufficient but there are areas that can be improved. See the example for the use of the word 'impact' listed above.</p> <p>In the introduction the first sentence states that Kenya 'belongs' to Africa. To the best of my knowledge, Kenya is 'located' in Africa but is not owned by Africa.</p> <p>In the section 3.3 Education, feeling the 'heat' of population growth does not sound very scientific. Actually there are a number of sentences in this section that could be improved to provide.</p> <p>In section 5.1 Conclusions, you state that scientists are 'split in the middle of three schools of thought'. Splitting something 'in the middle' divides it into two sections, not three.</p> <p>I think the title for the section '5.1 Conclusions' should be changed. Since no real scientific methodology or statistical study was conducted, this report is not 'conclusive'. It may be more appropriate to use a title such as 'Findings and Recommendations', or something similar.</p>	<p>Improvement has been done</p> <p>That has been changed</p> <p>Revision has been made</p> <p>Revision made</p> <p>This has been changed from conclusion to findings</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	