

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_102374
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study of Land Use and Gully Erosion in Nekede Community, Owerri West, Imo State, Nigeria Using the GIS.
Type of the 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. No, I suggest rewriting the abstract, the objective is not clear and the results are not present in it.</p> <p>4. Must be improved. I missed some subsections in the results for each of the presented results. There are many gaps in understanding the article.. the objective is not very clear, nor the methodology, only the maps are presented but the processing and results are not very clear. The result that I at least expected was the location of areas prone to ravine erosion identified from the various data presented. The materials, methods and results need to dialogue, which I miss in this work.</p> <p>5. yes but need to be improved. The discussion of the results needs to be improved. The author could have incorporated other variables as input data to analyse this phenomenon such as curvature, catchment area, TWI, and others. in the next point I suggest some articles that can enrich this part.</p> <p>6. There are few references throughout the article (eg in the introduction) and are old. There are sentences with data that need a source. There are many recent articles on this topic, I suggest just 2 as examples that can be cited. I challenge authors to look for recent references. Another issue is that the references throughout the text are not in sequence, the first reference appears with the number 9 and the following 6 and then 4.. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2021.103637 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iswcr.2022.04.001</p> <p>The objective of the article is not perceptible either in the abstract or in the introduction.</p> <p>I was expecting an image classified using digital image classification procedures, not an original image to access land use and land cover classes.</p> <p>Other comments are presented I the original text.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Can be improved	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lucrêncio Silvestre Macarringue
Department, University & Country	Instituto Politécnico de Ciências da Terra e Ambiente, Mozambique