

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_119892
Title of the Manuscript:	Intra-urban livestock breeding in the Sahel zone and the living environment of city dwellers in Maroua-Extrême-Nord Cameroon
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Here are my thoughts on the manuscript:</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Importance for scientific community: This manuscript provides valuable insights into the impacts of intra-urban livestock farming in a Sahelian city context. It examines an important but under-studied issue at the intersection of urban development, food systems, and environmental sustainability in African cities. The quantitative data on livestock numbers, waste production, and greenhouse gas emissions fills a gap in knowledge for this region.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Title: The title is suitable as it clearly conveys the main topic and geographical focus of the study. However, it is quite long and could potentially be shortened while retaining the key information.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Abstract: The abstract provides a good overview of the study's objectives, methods, and key findings. However, it could be improved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stating the sample size more clearly (211 households) - Providing more specific quantitative results on environmental impacts - Mentioning some of the proposed solutions/recommendations - Tightening the language in some areas to improve clarity 	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Structure and subsections: The overall structure follows a logical flow from introduction to methods, results, discussion and conclusion. The subsections break down the content appropriately. However, some subsections like</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>"1.3 The presence of natural grazing and grasses in urban and peri-urban areas" could potentially be consolidated to improve flow.</p> <p>Scientific correctness:</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Based on my review of the manuscript, here are some key areas where the research appears to lack or could be improved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Methodological details: The study lacks sufficient detail on some aspects of its methodology, particularly regarding statistical analysis methods. More information on how data was processed and analyzed would strengthen the scientific rigor. 2. Control group: There is no mention of a control group or comparison to areas without urban livestock. This makes it difficult to definitively attribute observed impacts solely to livestock farming. 3. Longitudinal data: The study provides a snapshot in time but lacks data on trends over time. This limits the ability to assess how impacts may be changing or evolving. 4. Economic analysis: While environmental and social impacts are covered, there's limited analysis of the economic impacts or cost-benefit considerations of urban livestock farming. 5. Policy analysis: The study could benefit from a more in-depth examination of existing policies and regulations related to urban livestock, and how these influence practices and impacts. 6. Stakeholder perspectives: While the study surveys livestock owners, it lacks direct input from other stakeholders like city officials, neighbors without livestock, or environmental agencies. 7. Comparative analysis: The study focuses on one city (Maroua) but lacks comparison to other Sahelian cities to understand how typical or unique the observed patterns are. 8. Mitigation strategies: While some solutions are proposed, there could be a more comprehensive analysis of potential mitigation strategies and their feasibility. 9. Health impact quantification: While health impacts are mentioned, the study lacks quantitative data on specific health outcomes related to urban livestock. 10. Spatial analysis: The study could benefit from more detailed spatial analysis of how livestock impacts vary across different parts of the city. 	

PART 2:

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Petros Chavula
Department, University & Country	Haramaya University, Ethiopia