

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	

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>)

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<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>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<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>Optional/General comments</p>	<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. Please, emphasize which are the results of your study and do not repeat the same things from the Introduction.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mihaela Tinca Udristoiu
Department, University & Country	University of Craiova, Romania