

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_114874
Title of the Manuscript:	A Normalised Difference Vegetation Index Model for Maize Crop Performance Monitoring and Cropland Area Mapping in Sudan Ecological Zone of Nigeria.
Type of the Article	

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>Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community, to increase literacy and can be used as a reference in assessing the NDVI at relatively similar regional conditions</p> <p>Yes, thr title of the article suitable</p> <p>In general, the abstract is not complete, so it needs to be added according to the rules for writing abstracts in general, as I have stated in the manuscript</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate, so they need to be adjusted</p> <p>The contents of this manuscript are scientifically correct, but the structure of the manuscript does not comply with journal/template structure rules</p> <p>There were only 7 references used. Of the 7 existing references, all are old years. For the article to have better quality, the author is expected to add citations to the latest and up-to-date articles.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>Yes, it is</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>1. For clarity, the abstract should be organized according to: a. Brief background (one or two sentences) b. Objectives of the study c. Data and research methods d. Analysis method e. Results f. Conclusion</p> <p>2. There are no citations taken from articles or books in this introduction. Therefore, add citations taken from any source!</p> <p>3. What is the difference between research objectives 1.2 and 1.3 which one is used?</p> <p>4. I don't think the description of sentinel-2 needs to be reviewed here, what is important is what path is used. So more details.</p> <p>5. A description of the lansat image is also not necessary. Instead, what is important is the image of Landsat 8 and what path, was taken in what month in what year.</p> <p>6. In the discussion, there is not a single reference that corroborates the results of this study. Please add at least a few references to create a proper discussion.</p> <p>The results and discussion are very confusing. The results obtained should be described by the objectives to be achieved.</p> <p>7. There were only 7 references used. Of the 7 existing references, all are old years. For the article to have better quality, the author is expected to add citations to the latest and up-to-date articles.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ajun Purwanto
Department, University & Country	Institute of Teacher Training and Education, Indonesia