

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_85508
Title of the Manuscript:	Conflict of Land Use Types over Geomorphological Space of Anambra State, Southeastern Nigeria: The Analyses and Predictions
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.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/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	<p>Introduction:</p> <p>-Authors need to create a paragraph that captures research progress, regarding the scope of this study in the study area and abroad. Here, it must be stated clearly what is known about the topic (what has been done already) elsewhere and domestically (in Nigeria or Anambra State), and what's unknown but important to be studied. This will lead readers to the objectives or main aim of the study.</p> <p>Line 184-190: The contribution of this study to decision-makers, international scientific community or researchers, land use planners, strategists, local authorities and other units must be stated clearly and given some more flesh in the last paragraph.</p> <p>Materials and Methods:</p> <p>Line 195-205: Why was Anambra State selected among other states in Nigeria? There must be justification.</p> <p>-The horizontal and vertical grids (co-ordinates) around Figures 3 and 4 could be reduced to just 3 or 4.</p> <p>Line 252-253: Was accuracy assessment conducted for satellite imagery generated? Authors must state clearly how the results generated for the satellite imageries were validated.</p> <p>-Were results compared to observed datasets to ensure consistency or accuracy in results generated?</p> <p>-Which data type (Example: Landsat 4/5 TM/MSS, Landsat 7 ETM+ and so on) was used for this? It must be stated clearly.</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>-Table 3: This caption is not appropriate for a scientific study. It must be re-written in a line or sentence format.</p> <p>-Figure 10: Authors need to check this critically. Vegetation and disturbed classes or features. Authors could explain in the methodology section description of each class.</p> <p>-How can we distinguish farmlands and shrubs or agricultural activities from disturbed vegetation?</p> <p>-Disturbed vegetation could be renamed as "farmlands and shrubs" or any named feature that appropriately describes the settings.</p> <p>-Figures 10, 11, 12 and 13 can be culminated and presented as one image that illustrates Land use cover changes over the given period with one legend, scale and direction for easy observation and comparison.</p> <p>-Table 6: I humbly suggest authors to take a look at the % change in each given class. Values presented are wrong. Kindly use (current/present state - previous state/previous state x 100%). Vegetation feature should be -46.02%, disturbed vegetation should be -5.51% andif these were generated using the ArcGIS software, kindly check the formula or expression used to correct these. If not, calculate the resultant changes manually to</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted and responded to Noted and responded to One of the reasons of research is to identify a problem, study the problem and proffer solution(s). Research like this, is supposed to be carried out in the area where the problem is identified, hence Anambra State as the study area in this case. There is no cartographic rule to the number of coordinates to be used, it is based on the map makers description, so far they are readable and not noisy (too much). Noted and responded to. Yes Noted and responded to Noted and responded to. Noted and responded to They are all under disturbed vegetation Noted and responded to This is someone's idea and other authors bought into it. These days in order to present maps in one page, they are squeezed to the extent that the information on the maps cannot be read. So in most cases, authors end up presenting unreadable maps in one page. In many cases, we have presented our maps in small sizes only for the editors to resize the maps according to their specifications, that is

Review Form 1.6

	<p>correct these errors.</p> <p>-Changes must reflect in the main text to ensure uniformity and consistency where necessary.</p> <p>-Authors should kindly state the specific excel version used. Again, the software and process of making the predictions must be stated clearly in the methodology section.</p> <p>-Which imageries were used as the base or reference for the predictions?</p> <p>-Figures 15a and 15b: Axis titles for the vertical/horizontal (variables used, thus, Years and LUCC trends (%)) must be added to added to the Fig.15a.</p> <p>-The legend or features (bare land, waterbodies, vegetation) could be placed below the years or horizontal axis</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>-I do not see any pragmatic discussion for this study. Authors need to discuss the results of this study, and not just replicate spatially generated results in the given images or tables. They need to discuss or explain policies, events, natural activities or biophysical factors, coupled with human activities driving these changes. Authors can refer to these latest articles on LUCC</p> <p>1. Sarfo, I., Shuoben, B., Beibei, L. <i>et al.</i> Spatiotemporal development of land use systems, influences and climate variability in Southwestern Ghana (1970–2020. <i>Environ Dev Sustain</i> (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01848-5</p> <p>2. Tolessa, T., Dechassa, C., Simane, B. <i>et al.</i> Land use/land cover dynamics in response to various driving forces in Didessa sub-basin, Ethiopia. <i>GeoJournal</i> 85, 747–760 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-019-09990-4 and cite or refer to them to enrich the introduction/conceptual framework and the discussion of this study.</p> <p>-The title of this study, aim/objectives and results generated need to be discussed with linkages.</p> <p>-Authors can link the results of this study to existing literature. They need to state where necessary, thus, which part of the study agrees with or disagrees with an existing study.</p> <p>-Spatial analysis could be linked to the correlation matrix or PCA analysis, backed by some policies or interventions which are driving LUCC changes over the given period.</p> <p>-Authors can discuss vividly and pragmatically the implications of future trends along with recommendations. Can these trends impact key sectors like: the energy, agriculture, water, food, Health, climate and so on?</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>-Findings based on predictions could be summarized and added to the main findings in the concluding section.</p> <p>-I humbly suggest authors include the significance of the study findings to key players and stakeholders.</p> <p>-What are the limitations or weaknesses of the study? They can be integrated in the concluding section.</p> <p>-Possible areas for further research and recommendations could be added here.</p>	<p>the reason we chose to leave the sizing of the maps to editors description.</p> <p>13. Table 6 is ok by the authors' calculations. For example, as at 1990, vegetation (forest) covered 2579.91 (53.26%) square kilometers of the study area. By 2020, vegetation cover came down to 1392.65 (28.75%). If you remove 28.75% from 53.26%, you will have 24.51%, which is the vegetation lost or change between 1990 and 2020.</p> <p>14. Table 6 are values generated from the LUCC maps, which were used in Microsoft Excel 2007 for the predictions.</p> <p>15. Attempts to label the figures (15a and 15b) made them too noisy, hence the removal of the labels and instead, explanations about the figures were given briefly.</p> <p>16. Noted and responded to</p> <p>17. Noted and responded to</p> <p>18. Noted and responded to</p> <p>19. Focus of this study is on Land use and not on LUCC. LUCC is used just as a tool to show the trend of change in land use.</p> <p>20. Noted and responded to</p> <p>21. Noted and responded to</p> <p>22. Noted and responded to</p> <p>23. Noted and responded to</p> <p>24. Noted and responded to</p>
--	--	--

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract:</p> <p>-The main aim or specific objective (s) is not clear in the abstract. The main aim must be stated clearly.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>Conceptual framework:</p> <p>-Which theories/concepts underline or anchor this study. They need to be integrated clearly based on the study title or scope.</p> <p>-Authors could cite or refer to this latest article (Sarfo, I., Shuoben, B., Beibei, L. et al. Spatiotemporal development of land use systems, influences and climate variability in Southwestern Ghana (1970–2020. <i>Environ Dev Sustain</i> (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01848-5) for such linkages in concepts of LUCC to enrich the introductory/literature section and the discussion of this study.</p> <p>Line 165-166: The sentence is quite ambiguous and needs to be reconstructed for clarity.</p> <p>Materials and Methods:</p> <p>-Figure.6: Kindly check the spelling in parameter C “remidial mod...” and correct it to read “remedial modification”.</p> <p>Same for parameter D & E: Correct the spelling of “remidial” and “...REDIURES” to read “...requires”</p> <p>-Proficiency level of the paper must be checked thoroughly. Moderate syntax errors and grammatical defects were detected in the manuscript.</p> <p>-Authors should look at the attached manuscript for additional minor comments in track changes.</p>	<p>25. Noted and responded to</p> <p>26. Noted and responded to</p> <p>27. Noted and responded to</p> <p>28. Noted and responded to</p> <p>29. Noted and responded to</p> <p>30. Noted and responded to</p> <p>31. Noted with thanks</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript has appropriate ingredients to be accepted for publication. It is generally informative and relevant to regional and local land use studies. It can be considered for publication once authors have fully integrated the suggested and mandatory comments/revisions.</p>	<p>32. Thank you</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	