

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_96656
Title of the Manuscript:	Space-based Mapping And Assessment of a Three-decade Urban Landcover Dynamics Towards a Smart Federal Capital City, Abuja, Nigeria
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://journalajgr.com/index.php/AJGR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>The manuscript is important for the local community.</p> <p>The title is suitable even they do not talk about</p> <p>The Abstract is not very comprehensive. I do not understand why the authors insisted so much on IT, AI, IoT, and ICT in their paper talk without emphasizing the novelty of their work, results, and methodology. I know what means “smart city” and I do not see here the link between smart city and their research. Remote sensing is not enough. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct but needs improvements.</p> <p>The references are enough.</p>	<p>I have been able to review the revised version to reflect the observations made by the Reviewer.</p> <p>The Revised Version has the updated in YELLOW COLOUR BACKGROUND.</p>
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>English quality of this article should be improved. There are an important number of mistakes. My suggestion is to use software that can help you.</p>	<p>Improvement on English Language in terms of sentence structure and re-arrangement has been carried out in order to meet the observed standard.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The authors said that their study “shows that over the last thirty (30) years (2000, 2010 to 2020), builtup urban land cover has increased significantly from 72.88 km² (22.04%) in year 2000 to 145.77km² (44.09%) in 2020”. Which is exactly the period of time in your study? Also, please write the source of your data.</p> <p>I see the eq.1 as a picture and it should not be a picture.</p> <p>Please, emphasize which are the results of your study and do not repeat the same things from the Introduction.</p>	<p>The study used 3 time period Satellites Image data from Global Land Cover Facility website.</p> <p>Time difference of 10 years each spanning 30 years period (2000, 2010, and 2020).</p> <p>The equation has been updated using the Equation Editor in MS Word Software.</p> <p>Results obtained have been emphasized and repetitions eliminated in the Introduction and elsewhere where found.</p>

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