

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_106635
Title of the Manuscript:	Landscape Planning and Design Approaches for Ecologically Sustainable Cities
Type of the 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 topic is a good area for study. It will benefit all the stakeholders. "Landscape Planning and Design Approaches for Ecologically Sustainable Cities" 2. ABSTRACT: the abstract should be writing in proper way. That is the introduction, method used, result generated and recommendation and conclusion. Presently everything is muddle up. 3. Introduction: in the introduction there is no single reference in this section. 4. This paper should be sectionalized into 1.0 introduction, 2.0 literature review, 3.0 methodology, 4.0 results, 5.0 discussion of finding, 6.0 conclusions etc. 5. There a lot of paragraphs that is not properly reference in the literature review. 6. The comprehensive recommendations expounded in the text regarding the significance and exigency of ecological design in urban contexts can be succinctly summarized as follows (Atıl et al., 2005; Coşgun, 2013; Birişçi et al., 2012; Kiper et al., 2016; Korkut and Kiper, 2016; Üstün Topal et al., 2016): this statement is not clear. Line 365 to 368, page 8. Is not clear. Please avoid the use of bullet. Instead use a, b, c, or 1, 2, 3. 7. Line 409 page 9. 'In conclusion' is confusing. I think this should be used in concluding paragraph. also line 454 page 10 'In conclusion', 8. Conclusion. This paragraph is too long. The conclusion should emanate from your findings. It is not about another literature review. 9. REFERENCES Zipperer et al in the text but not in reference section while Zippinger,W. C., J., Wu, R.V., Pouyat, S. T. A., Pickett, 2000 is in reference section but not in the text and many more of this error. Please check. 10. Please check some your word usage some are in America language. E.g. catalyzing, preemptively, fulfill, centered, livable, endeavor among others. Other many grammar error need to be edited. 11. Current referencing in 2021, 20222 and 2023 should be incorporated. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Olusola Oladapo Makinde
Department, University & Country	Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Nigeria