

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_109489
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Sustainable Ibadan Project's (SIP) difficulties: A case study of Ayeye portable water supply in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject of the manuscript is important for the scientific community. The issues raised in the article are aimed at the further development of science in the direction of issues of sustainable development of cities and regions of any country in the world. 2. I offer 2 variants of the new title of the article: 1. The Ayeye Portable Water Supply Project in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria is one of the main components of the Sustainable Development of Ibadan (SIP). 2. Pre-project sociological studies of the Ayeye portable water supply in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria – the basis (or foundation) for the sustainable development of Ibadan (SIP) 3. The abstract structurally does not correspond to the general principles of composing an abstract: from the formulation of the goal, the tasks solved in the work, to scientific novelty, practical value, the essence of the work and conclusions. Therefore, it is completely impossible to form any idea about the content of the work by the abstract, except for placing the purpose of the work at the end of the abstract. 4. The correspondence of the subdivisions and the structure of the manuscript is explained in detail in point 3 when answering the correspondence of the annotation. (above by text). 5. The manuscript will become scientifically correct after finalizing the annotation and the entire text of the article according to our recommendations and placing all sections according to the new annotation. 6. All 10 links (a rather insignificant number that does not cover all the tasks set at the beginning of the research) have an expiration date of 12 or more years, which is the problem of this article. None of the references is aimed at assessing the representativeness of the sample in terms of the number of respondents (or the author did not pay attention to the representativeness of the research results). <p>Positive recommendations and comments to the article: 1. Pay special attention to the representativeness of the sample in all sociological studies. 2. Conclusions are not a statement of results, but a scientific analysis of research results, which should fully qualitatively and quantitatively correspond to the tasks set to achieve the goal of the work. (By the way, there is no answer to the first 2 tasks in the work at all). 4. To obtain objective information, it is necessary to interview 2.5% of respondents. 5. Clause 3.6 (Techniques of Data analysis) must have number 2.6. 6. In our opinion, the author should either reduce the number of results presented in the tables, or for clarity and reduce the accumulation in the text from an insane number of tables, make a presentation in the form of diagrams (histograms). Reducing the number of tables (by combining some studies as essentially the same) will allow the author to focus more on achieving results from the main tasks of the article.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>For non-English-speaking scientists, the answer to this question is very difficult! But there are wishes in this regard in the additional recommendations.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Without finalizing the tasks and highlighting the practical value with the possibility of use, the article loses its scientific significance. All of the above can be achieved by following the recommendations of a valid review.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sankov Petro
Department, University & Country	Prydniprov's'ka State Academy of Civil Engineering and Architecture, Ukraine