

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_117564
Title of the Manuscript:	Solid Waste Disposal Systems in Fako Division, South West Region of Cameroon
Type of the 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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Solid waste management is a huge environmental and socio-economic problem in developing countries like Cameroon. Therefore, continued research is necessary to find solutions to challenges being faced. The current title “Solid Waste Disposal Systems in Fako Division, South West Region of Cameroon” is just flat and does not convey any problem and solution to address it as required in research projects. Therefore, the title of “Challenges and Solutions of Solid Waste Disposal Systems in Fako Division, South West Region of Cameroon” is proposed to improve it. The abstract is appropriate and comprehensive. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. However, they are unnumbered. They should therefore be numbered as suggested in the manuscript itself. The manuscript has scientific relevance and application especially in a fast urbanizing world and especially developing countries. The 32 references would be sufficient. However, majority of the references are quite old because there were only 5 references (about 16%) in the last five years to-date i.e. 2019-2024. <p>The following URLs are given for 10 most recent contemporary studies on solid waste management listed in order of most recent downwards. The author(s) should consider reviewing them as some of them are in developing countries and more so in countries near Cameroon that may offer geographical similarity in various aspects:</p> <p>https://doi.org/10.3390/soilsystems6040090</p> <p>https://doi.org/10.3390/earth2040062</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>English used is acceptable for scholarly communication on condition that the author(s) revise most especially their grammar as suggested freely and in good spirit and good faith throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> <p>General comments: See details in Reviewer's comment column</p>	<p><u>GENERAL COMMENTS</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar: There are a lot of grammatical errors of especially using present tense instead of past tense. I have laboured to correct most, if not all, of them as highlighted in green in contrast to yours highlighted in red. <i>Please contrast this with your discussion that is largely in acceptable present tenses because they show your opinion i.e. voice on the results in contrast to past scholarly works.</i> Length of sentences: Use short sentences that have not more than two related points to communicate. Long sentences that bundle many points within a sentence tend to confuse your readers from following up your dissertation/thesis. I have broken few long sentences into two 	

Review Form 1.7

<p>General comments: See details in Reviewer's comment column</p> <p>1. Introduction</p> <p>2. Study Area and Methodology</p> <p>3. Methodology</p> <p>4. Results</p>	<p>sentences without compromising/changing what you intended to communicate.</p> <p>3. Headings: Use sentence cases for your section headings, Table and Figure headings as well. Please consult with the Editor of the Journal and or use Journal template, if available, for guidance and compliance.</p> <p>4. Numberings: Number all section heads as suggested.</p> <p>5. Punctuations: Do not use a comma (,) before "and" as you near end of a sentence.</p> <p>6. Justification: Justify your text evenly between your left and right margins. Please check the text immediately after Figure 10 which I have right-justified. Your original manuscript, at least for this section/part mentioned, was not right-justified.</p> <p>General Comments Continued:</p> <p>7. Results and discussion: A good part of your results seem to contain discussion of results yet you have a separate section for discussion. This introduces repetitions that may confuse your readership and consequently also increase the length of your manuscript unnecessarily.</p> <p>8. Corrections: All suggested corrections to correct your grammar, punctuations, etc. are highlighted in green in contrast to yours in highlighted in red and struck through. Please delete yours and change the suggested green texts into black and white when resubmitting your revised manuscript. PLEASE ZOOM YOUR DOCUMENT IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO SEE SOME OF THE PUNCTUATION MARKS THAT YOU MAY NOT BE ABLE TO SEE AT SMALLER ZOOM</p> <p>9. Within text referencing: Revise some of your references like yours of Jhamnani and Singh, (2009) to <u>Jhamnani and Singh (2009)</u> and Folefack, (2008) to <u>Folefack (2008)</u>. Please discern where you were wrong (<i>i.e. the comma , just after author name outside the bracketed year of publication</i> !!!)</p> <p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</p> <p>1.1 Since you defined Municipal Solid Waste Management (MSWM) at its first appearance, you do not need to repeat both full text and abbreviation subsequently.</p> <p>1.2 Split paragraph 3 into two as suggested.</p> <p>2.1 Number sub-heading "Study Area and Methodology" as 2. Study Area and Methodology</p> <p>2.2 Delete the compass cardinal directions highlighted in red and struck through and replace them with the suggested versions highlighted in green.</p> <p>2.3 Delete the repeated sentence (second last sentence) that has been highlighted in red and struck through.</p> <p>3.1 Number sub-heading "Methodology" as 3. Methodology</p> <p>3.2 Bold the last row of Table 1 for the totals</p> <p>3.3 Third line after Table 1: You contradict yourself in describing rank order of population of the towns as presented in Table 1. Please correct by deleting the wrong description as highlighted in red and struck through and replace with the suggested correct description in green text.</p> <p>3.4 Table 2: Should wholly appear on same page for ease of reference and follow-up. Therefore, please push it to appear entirely on the next page.</p> <p>3.5 Font size of texts in tables: Use smaller sizes like 9 or 10. Please consult the Editor of the Journal for full compliance.</p> <p>3.6 Resize column widths of tables: Applies to Tables Table 1 and Table 2 AND POSSIBLY all TABLES..</p> <p>3.7 Format texts in tables: Applies mainly to Table 3 as suggested in green texts.</p> <p>5.1 Number sub-heading "Results" as 4. Results</p> <p>5.2 Number sub-heading "Waste Disposal Systems and Facilities" as 4.2 Waste Disposal Systems</p>	
---	--	--

Review Form 1.7

5. Conclusion	<p>and Facilities</p> <p>5.3 Bold the last row of Table 3 for the totals</p> <p>5.4 Number sub-heading "Open Dumping" as 4.2 Open Dumping</p> <p>5.5 Split the first paragraph of 4.2 Open Dumping into two as suggested for logical and thematic flow of your result discussion.</p> <p>5.6 Number sub-heading "Open burning" as 4.3 Open burning</p> <p>5.7 Number sub-heading "Incineration" as 4.4 Incineration</p> <p>5.8 Number sub-heading "Landfill" as 4.5 Landfill</p> <p><u>Specific Comments Continued:</u></p> <p>5. Number sub-heading "Conclusion" as 6. Conclusion</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Julius Caesar Kwio-Tamale
Department, University & Country	Kyambogo University, Uganda