



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ AIR_20585</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL INNOVATIONS IN BUS RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM IN LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA</b>
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Based on the manuscript, the author stated that the data were collected through the use of questionnaires, therefore, it is recommended to display the questionnaires used in this study.</li> <li>2. In addition, the processes of implementation of questionnaires, including the sampling methods and the number of samples etc., should be clearly describes.</li> <li>3. Moreover, after implementing questionnaires, it is necessary to summarize and analyse the results of questionnaires.</li> <li>4. The conclusions and recommendations should be drawn out based on the analysis, I thus suggest rethinking and rewriting the manuscript.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agreed (Questionnaire has been attached)</li> <li>2. The processes of implementation of questionnaires, including the sampling methods and the number of samples was clearly described.</li> <li>3. The result of the guided oral interview with the use of questionnaires were properly summarized and well explained.</li> <li>4. The conclusions and recommendations were drawn based on the analysis.</li> <li>5. Some adjustments and modifications has been made on the work</li> <li>6. I will suggest that the reviewer should go through the work again.</li> </ol>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All of the authors' last names should be listed in the REFERENCES, rather than Levinson et al. for short in Mo. 5, please revise.</li> <li>2. The header of Table 1 should be revised, more specifically, instead of Wright, Wright and Lewis (2005) is better.</li> <li>3. In Line 9, instead of "lessen," alleviate is better.</li> <li>4. A space is needed between two words, please proofread one more time carefully.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agreed (correction has been effected).</li> <li>2. Agreed (correction has been effected).</li> <li>3. Agreed (correction has been effected).</li> <li>4. Corrected.</li> </ol>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		