

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_84578
Title of the Manuscript:	Participatory Geographic Information System (PGIS) Mapping; an Integrated Flood Management Tool in the Flood Prone Areas of Kano Plains, Nyando Sub-county, Kisumu County, Kenya
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.journalgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy>)

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>The abstract is not well written. There are lots of grammatical errors in the abstract. (for example: <i>Nevertheless, the challenge with these strategies employed is that they seldom give audience to the people affected, instead focusing on technical solutions.</i>). However, recommendation or policy implication is missing in the abstract.</p> <p>The aim and objectives of the study is missing.</p> <p>The summary of findings should have a separate heading from the conclusion (e.g 4.0 Summary and Conclusion of Findings).</p> <p>The conclusion section of the article is not well written. I suggest that the conclusion should be in paragraph. The use of numbering in the conclusion is not an academic style of writing. Recommendations or policy implications is missing in the article.</p>	<p>Revised again</p> <p>Noted</p>
Minor REVISION comments	All the tables were not formatted in journal table format.	Okay
Optional/General comments	Author needs to thoroughly revise the article on grammatical errors for reading clarity.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	