

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_129411
Title of the Manuscript:	Spatial Configuration of Market Spaces: Accessibility and Management Challenges in Bamenda City, Cameroon
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides critical insights into the spatial organization and accessibility challenges of market spaces in rapidly urbanizing cities, using Bamenda, Cameroon, as a case study. By employing both qualitative and quantitative methods, it offers a nuanced understanding of the socio-economic and infrastructural factors influencing urban market functionality.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	(i) The abstract lacks a clear statement of the research problem and objectives upfront. The reader might benefit from a concise articulation of the main research question or problem being addressed. (ii) The abstract contains numerous details about findings, such as market types and issues like congestion and infrastructure challenges. While these are relevant, condensing this information into broader themes might enhance readability and impact.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	YES, The study used a mixed research design integrating both quantitative and qualitative methods to investigate the spatial arrangement and management of market spaces in Bamenda city.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More references are required as follows: (i) Agboola, O. P., Azizul, M. F., Rasidi, M. H., & Said, I. (2018). The cultural sustainability of traditional market place in Africa: A new research agenda. Journal of Rural Studies, 62, 87-106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2018.07.001 (ii) Agboola, O. P. (2022). The significance of rural markets as a public space in Nigeria. Habitat International, 122, 102519. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2022.102519 (iii) Agboola, O. P., Rasidi, M. H., & Said, I. (2017). The influence of open space utilization on residents’ attachment with community: A case study of rural market square in southwest Nigeria. Archnet-Ijar, 11(1), 44-66.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript needs editing to correct some grammatical errors.	
Optional/General comments	- The study’s theoretical framework or context should include some reference to urban planning or market design theories. The suggested published manuscripts here would help in strengthen the academic grounding of the study. - The study focuses on Bamenda. While this is appropriate for a localized study, adding a sentence about how the findings contribute to broader urban planning or market accessibility discussions could enhance its relevance and appeal. - The recommendation section should be after the conclusion section	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with the 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail) NO	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	NO	
If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.	NO	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Reviewer:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write “I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer”

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0).....8	
Guideline: Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	

Review Form 3

Editorial Comments (This section is reserved for the comments from journal editorial office and editors):

	Author's Feedback

Reviewer Details:

This section is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate.
Please complete this section carefully. Reviewer Certificate will be generated by using this information only.
Your Certificate will be wrong, if you provide incorrect information.
Please note modification of certificate will not be possible after generation.
Certificate will not be issued if incomplete information is provided.

Name of the Reviewer	OLUWAGBEMI GA PAUL AGBOOLA
Department of Reviewer	ARCHITECTURE DEPARTMENT
University or Institution of Reviewer	ISTANBUL GELISIM UNIVERSITY
Country of Reviewer	TURKEY
Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer	ASST PROFESSOR
Email ID of Reviewer	
WhatsApp Number of Reviewer (Optional)	
Write 5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer	