

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	Short research article (NB : Subject to the comments and corrections requested)

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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <p>Delete or review this expression. It's too affirmative Rephrase this sentence: "Data was qualitative analysis", it is not understandable This verb "to condense" may not be appropriate in this case</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review this last idea « the delineal.....terrestrial surface » of the sentence. It's not understandable - Starting a sentence directly with an author's quote is not very appropriate. It is advisable to quote the authors in the middle or at the end of the sentence - The author's quote is missing : « Such human.....of the world » - Remove this punctuation <p>Material et methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please remove the underline. Do not underline any title unless it is a requirement of the AJAEES journal. - For all tables, adopt the new table format without line unless the current style is a specific requirement of the AJAEES newspaper. - You didn't mention the material used. Highlight in the development the list of equipment used. - In addition, create a separate title for "Description of the study setting" - The figures are blurry. Rework the images as much as possible to have figures with a lot of clarity - No abbreviation in the title of the figures - Delete the number 6 then merge these two boxes - Wrong value, different from what was mentioned above. Redo the calculation - Remove this parenthesis - Higher, you announced 2021 - 2022 or 2021 ??? ; Higher, you announced 2021 <p>Results and discussions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With this title, the presentation of the results and the discussions will be simultaneous. In your development, the result part is separated from the discussion part. Therefore, the title at this level should simply be "Results" - In the presentation of the results, use short transition sentences to move from one section to another. - In this part, after the title "Results", the presentation of the results must be preceded by two or three short sentences to justify the methodology used and then attest to the veracity and validity of the results obtained. - Please remove the underline - I propose to delete this word "endemic" - Mark a period (.) To signify the end of the sentence - The sentence is confusing. There is confusion between actor and typology of land management. Try to rephrase the sentence. It must also be taken into account throughout the document. - Figure 2 very difficult to read. Rework the quality of the figure to make it more readable - Add in reference to this part the number of the table - Idem, add a few figures from the table by reference to this part - Attention, review all the values in the table. - In addition, for all tables, use the new table formats without a separator line. Unless the 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>present format is a specific requirement of the journal AJAEES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 55905, Erroneous value, are you sure of your numbers?- What does 11 mean?- 55934, Incorrect number- Idem : Review the wording of this sentence a bit- Figure 3 illegible, to be redone. Change the format, pattern and especially the colors to make them more readable and more expressive- What is the unit?- Use the new rowless table style for all tables- That's a lot of information for one source. We must remove the doubt. If possible, add additional sources or references directly in the table in brackets at the end of the elements <p>- New table style,</p> <p>- Same as table 3, add additional sources please. If not, it gives the impression that you have copied the table into a document. But if the work is oriented on the reports of the same project, it is accepted.</p> <p>- Same as the previous tables,</p> <p>- New table style</p> <p>- Additional sources or references if possible</p> <p>- Diagram to be repeated. The different axes (abscissa; ordinate) must appear clearly to facilitate reading</p> <p>- This reference came back several times. It gives a bad impression. I hope this information comes from reports from the same project. If so, it is accepted</p> <p>- New format, If possible, complete other references</p> <p>- Same as the other tables, Kindly harmonize</p> <p>- I notice that this reference is used a lot. Are there no other sources ?</p> <p>- No abbreviation in the title</p> <p>- New table format</p> <p>- Means ? Write the whole word</p> <p>- No title underline</p> <p>- Review the format of Table 10</p> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- In the wording of this title delete "of results" and simply keep "Discussion"- The discussion (1/2 page) is too short compared to the results (8 pages). This shows an imbalance in the work which is too noticeable. Try to develop the discussion part a little more.- This discussion part has two axes, namely the comparison of the results with those of previous work and then the explanation of the concordant and divergent results. In your efforts, we do not clearly perceive these two sequences. We invite you to reformulate the discussion part completely.- Close the hook	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.6

	<p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The conclusion part is not numbered. Delete number 3.3. - The title of this part is entitled "Conclusion and Recommendations". In development, you didn't mention the recommendations. It is then necessary to delete recommendations in the wording of the title. The title is now: "Conclusion". - Finally, we must leave in the conclusion some applications of the results obtained <p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proofread the references to harmonize. Standardize a single style in the bibliography according to the "Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology" requirements. - If possible, try to provide more references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This reference Source: [17]; Field Survey (2021), came back several times. It gives a bad impression. I hope this information comes from reports from the same project. If so, it is accepted 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Material and methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In addition, create a separate title for "Description of the study setting" <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use the new rowless table style for all tables - In the presentation of the results, use short transition sentences to move from one section to another. - This reference came back several times. It gives a bad impression. I hope this information comes from reports from the same project. If so, it is accepted 	

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Wilfrid Hinnoutondji Kpetehoto</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University Of Abomey-Calavi (Uac), Benin</i>