

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	

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 is importance for the scientific community by giving understanding in using remote sensing and ecological modelling in Opuntia Stricta distribution in Kenya's Tsavo East National Park. The method used is also quite innovative by using Sentinel-2 imagery in different seasonal periods with combination with MaxEnt modelling to map the distribution. The introduction and discussion sections, while thorough, can be overly detailed and lack conciseness. The practical recommendations and actionable insights are somewhat underdeveloped. Visuals need refinement, and technical terms could be better explained for accessibility.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is quite suitable It would be better to include the method in the title such as ""Habitat Suitability Modeling for the Invasive Opuntia stricta Using Remote Sensing and MaxEnt in Tsavo East National Park, Kenya""	
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 is quite comprehensive in providing a summary of the study's objectives, methods, key findings, and relevance. It would be better to include relevancy and application, limitations, clarity to avoid overly technical languages and terms	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate and follow a logical progression. It would be better to divide and elaborate more in the discussion part into several sub-sections such as comparison with previous studies, limitations, and implications for conservation. The conclusion part could be added with the recommendations for future research	
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 and technically sound. Although the combination methods used in the study is quite robust, some justifications of why choosing the methods should be addressed. In addition, the analysis of each result need to be improved and cleared. For instance, the interpretation of the model evaluation result, is the model accurate enough?, can it be compared with other model? The writing style also could be improved by combining several short sentences so it will give a more concise and well-structured sentences.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most of the references are above 2010, so those are relatively new	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Some sentence structure and flow need to be improved, there are some incorrect grammar and punctuations, need consistency in terminology, some sentences need to be improved in term of academic tone	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Hendra Kurnia Febriawan
Department, University & Country	University of Auckland, Indonesia