

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ JGEESI _78195
Title of the Manuscript:	Stakeholders' Interactions and Land Management Options in Bui Division, North West Region of 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.journalajees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Introduction part</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The study should indicate the rational and research gaps as well as specific objectives ✓ Should indicate the hypothesis or research questions <p>Methods part</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Methods are not clear ✓ Sample size determination methods are not indicated ✓ Data collecting instruments were not indicated ✓ Software for ANOVA were not indicated <p>Results and discussion part</p> <p>Result and discussion should be written</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. in past tense form 2. First you should write the findings/ results of your study 3. Then discuss/reason out the result with your idea 4. Support or contrast the results with current findings 5. Indicate the results in tables, graphs or bars <p>Conclusion and recommendation part</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Written well <p>References part</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Very limited references ie. It needs more reviewing of current findings related to the problem/title 	
Minor REVISION comments	Poor way of writing especially in the methods, and result & discussion part. Hence, it should be written again following the scientific ways of writing	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Habtamu Admas Desta
Department, University & Country	Injibara University, Ethiopia