



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
in Abstract ✓ What is the place of land cover/use assessment in the study? It has no direct link or any important results to be reported in the first place. An NDVI or a Soil adjusted vegetation index is sufficient here. In Introduction ✓ Check clearly the citation by [1] something is missing ✓ Geomorphic hazard (geospatial) mapping??? Why not geomorphic hazard mapping? ✓ Very few reviews still exist on gully erosion and its mapping using geospatial techniques. Reduce the more generalistic review on geomorphic hazards and land use change assessment using geospatial techniques. Citations by 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 do not have their place in this study. ✓ Too many objectives still persist In methods ✓ The role played by the use of ASTER DEM of 30m vis a vis the size of the study area or site was not supported or justified. What is the area (ha or km² or m²) of the study site? ✓ NDVI or soil adjusted vegetation index is sufficient to evaluate vulnerable areas. General comment The author(s) returned the article for a re-review with much in the same manner as the original submitted paper was. Rather author(s) maintained the initial structure of paper in most cases with no convincing explanations of such. The abstract still starts by reported results not primordial to the work, the literature review in most cases still remains very general and not focus to the initial topic. Much has been reviewed on geomorphic hazards and land use change assessment using geospatial and remote sensing techniques as a whole leaving aside gully erosion. The results and discussions section still remain badly written, author(s) prefer to maintain much of it as it was with not concrete justification. Table 4, and figures 6, 7, 8,9,11 have no clear contribution to the work. More also, these figures do not help in the visualization of the problem as justified by the author(s). The grammar (spellings and punctuations) all over the paper was not proof-read before resubmission.	► The land cover/use enhance the understanding of the proportion of land put to various uses in the study area. Both land use/NDVI work together. ► The citation [1] has been checked and corrected. ► Corrected to read geomorphic hazard mapping see line 1 & 2 of paragraph 3 ► The citations in question are still relevance in this context so long as they used geospatial tools in evaluation of related issues. ► The issue regarding objective have been addressed accordingly. Regarding the general comments: The corrections have been effected and grammars check. Figures that were not making clear contribution to the work were removed as suggested. The result section have been re-arrange and discuss with the figure in focus