

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_105359
Title of the Manuscript:	A Holistic Approach to Land Valuation Using Automated Valuation Models (AVMs): A Case Study in Homagama Divisional Secretarial Administrative Boundary, Sri Lanka
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<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. The research provides a great example of applying automated valuation models to land valuation and in developing countries. It has contributed valuable evidence to the scientific community by demonstrating the possibility and feasibility of using geospatial technology to improve accurate and reliable land valuation.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Yes.</p> <p>Additional comments:</p> <p>1) In Table 1, the authors should provide the year of data collection for each factor. Significant bias could be introduced if there is a substantial difference in the years of data.</p> <p>2) For Fig.2, the unit is lacking in each map. For example, what is the unit of population in the population map? The legends for points are unprofessional and unclear, such as "Hospital_pt". The maps should be labeled as "(a),(b),(c)" and so on in Fig.2. Please check all other figures as well.</p> <p>3) The first paragraph of 3.3.1 should be revised. "In the initial stage, eight thematic data layers were established". "Following this, the eleven raster layers were reclassified into eight." The two sentences are inconsistent. Please check the number.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Comment [VL1]: I don't understand

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Huipeng Liao
Department, University & Country	University of North Carolina, USA