

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_98405
Title of the Manuscript:	SPATIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PUBLIC ACTIVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES IN UYO URBAN, AKWA IBOM STATE, 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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript presents the issue widely and can be considered highly valuable in the research area.</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate for the subject which it studies.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive, presenting all the necessary information for a general reader. We recommend that the author provide different keywords than those in the article's title to give the reader a larger perspective on the subject from the beginning.</p> <p>4. The author managed to review the issues and endow the data and information appropriately to give the reader a complete perspective.</p> <p>5. The manuscript provides all the necessary information to be considered scientifically correct; it is precise and follows the values and scientific methods.</p> <p>6. The references are not just sufficient and recent ; they are also from different regions of the world, and their comparative presentation gives the article a plus.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The author proved to have a large knowledge of English the language flow if suitable for scholars.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>We appreciate de research transversality.</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:	Carusan Mihaela Victorita
Department, University & Country	University of Political Studies and Public Administration, Romania