

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_79868
Title of the Manuscript:	Incidence Land Use Change on Flooding and River Bank Erosion in Ngoketunjia Division, North West Region, Cameroon
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The methodology is not structured and sequential steps should be clearly put together • Introduction needs to mention present studies in this domain and the research gap needs to be established • Grounding to literature is completely insufficient. Refer more structured research paper and ground your work to national and international literature. • Aim of the research is superficial. You need to be very clear and objective in your aim and methodology following it. • Methodology needs to be rewritten. There is a lot of casual information of performing measurability of susceptibility, resilience and exposure. But there is no clear methodology for the same. Secondly even if you are trying to use the people's perception, it has to be objective while interpreting the indicators and methodology needs to be stated clearly. • The attempted two components of research, change in river Bankline and risk perception through survey are not interconnected appropriately. • At this point it is just data rich manuscript. But synthesis and analysis and research output is completely missing. • The results are not drawn properly. Discussions are not done only. The conclusion is almost not there. Rewrite discussion, and conclusion 	
Minor REVISION comments	Refer good research paper as your background research	
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:	Neha Bansal
Department, University & Country	SRM Institute Of Science And Technology, India