



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_40224
Title of the Manuscript:	APPLICATION OF GEOSPATIAL TECHNOLOGIES IN ASSESSING GULLY EROSION IN THE HUMID TROPICS OF ENIONG OFFOT, UYO, AKWA IBOM STATE
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:

(<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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In abstract ✓ Abstract is badly written, starting with an objective and results not focusing on the title of the study, i.e land cover/use results. ✓ The abstract MUST include; • A brief introduction • Problem/rationale of study • Objective • Methods/analysis • Main findings and recommendations (if any). Introduction In aims and objectives ✓ There is no difference between aims and objectives. It is same thing. ✓ Too many research objectives for a small study like this one. Methods ✓ How was 30m ASTER DEM used here and for what purpose? ✓ Also, the gully site is a very small area, so how was a DEM of 30m resolution applicable here? ✓ What place did land cover/land use analysis/classification play in the study? ✓ It is same for NDVI Results ✓ So many maps are presented of which does not have direct link with the study as well as the set objectives. Most of the maps are irrelevant; for instance figures 7, 9-12. ✓ Figures and tables not explained in detail. ✓ It is appropriate to merge this section as Results and Discussions ✓ Objectives not attained, e.g objective 1. In conclusion ✓ <i>The results presented in this paper will enable for future researchers to make comparisons with their results regarding topographic imagery and land use/cover change information.</i> This is not a contribution to the field. ✓ ground-trotting. This is not the right spelling	IN THE ABTRACT The issues the reviewer raise regarding the abstract format has been look into and the needful ones corrected. INTRODUCTION The aim has been removed. However, the aim is generalized and the objectives are specific, drawn from the stated aim. Similarly, the tasks have already been performed, so the number of objectives need not be a serious issue now. METHODS I don't think the area is very small as the reviewer perceived, especially when considering the various attributes that the maps cover. The place of land use/land cover provide the basis for visualizing the vulnerable enable Result The arrangement in the result section are valid and the maps provide enabling ground for visualization of the phenomena in view. Conclusion The two issues raise have been corrected accordingly.
Minor REVISION comments	In introduction and study area • Geomorphological mapping is not geospatial mapping • Köppen and not Koppen	• The two issues raise in the introduction has been corrected accordingly. However, the context entails the used of geo-spatial tools in solving geomorphological problem.
Optional/General comments	The paper in first place put forth an interesting research topic. This notwithstanding, the whole paper is poorly written, leave aside the grammar and spellings. The introduction as well as the conclusion embrace too many conceptual issues in the field of geomorphology, GIS and remote sensing. Some of this concepts are not directly linked to the study thereby making the work more alike to a discussion of concepts in geography. As such, the existing literature that was consulted when writing the paper was not well chosen. This consequently led to unguided objectives, methodology and results. Most set objectives and research questions were never investigated and presented to the work. The work in first place aimed to show the extent of gully erosion site, but no such spatio-temporal analysis was made. Much is still needed to make work concise and warrant publication. See the comments above. ✓ Proof reading to improve on English	The language perspective of the work has been reviewed and key issues corrected. Thank you for your observations regarding this article.