

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_127212
Title of the Manuscript:	Modelling habitat suitability for Occurrence of invasive species Opuntia Stricta in the Southern Part of Tsavo East National Park, Kenya
Type of the Article	Research article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses the critical issue of biological invasions, focusing on the invasive species <i>Opuntia stricta</i> in Tsavo East National Park, Kenya. Using remote sensing, GIS, and MaxEnt modelling, the study predicts habitat suitability and identifies key environmental factors driving its spread. The comprehensive methodology enhances understanding of invasive species dynamics and provides valuable insights for conservation efforts. I appreciate the manuscript's thorough methodology and its potential to guide policymakers and park managers in prioritizing control measures for invasive species.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Is quite suitable. It clearly conveys the main focus of the study, which is the modelling of habitat suitability for the invasive species <i>Opuntia stricta</i> in a specific region.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is quite comprehensive, covering the key aspects of the study, including the threat of biological invasions, the use of remote sensing and geographic information systems. However, there are a few suggestions: Mention the specific environmental variables that were found to be most effective in detecting <i>Opuntia stricta</i> .	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are well-organized and appropriate for a scientific study.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust, employing a comprehensive methodology and rigorous data analysis. The use of MaxEnt modelling, remote sensing, and GIS provides a reliable framework for predicting habitat suitability of <i>Opuntia stricta</i> . The findings are supported by a thorough evaluation of environmental variables, enhancing the model's accuracy. The detailed presentation of results, including response curves and suitability maps, showcases high scientific rigor and technical proficiency.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references in the manuscript are quite comprehensive and cover a wide range of relevant studies. However, there are a few recent studies that could be added to enhance the manuscript's depth and relevance: https://doi.org/10.1080/09583157.2021.1932747 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10530-017-1453-x	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is well-written, with clear and concise language that effectively conveys the research findings. However, minor improvements could enhance readability, such as ensuring consistency in terminology, particularly with the scientific name <i>Opuntia stricta</i> . Additionally, a thorough proofreading to address any grammatical or punctuation errors would be beneficial.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, the manuscript makes a significant contribution to the field of invasive species management and conservation.	

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:	Sushma B
Department, University & Country	Ramaiah Institute of Technology, India