



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_45231
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSING THE STATUS YANDEV FOREST RESERVE USING REMOTE SENSING AND GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS) TECHNIQUES.
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	a) Under image classification (page 7), the author should indicate the combination of bands and their corresponding resolutions that were used for analysis as regards 1986, 2001, 2012. This is mandatory in image analysis. b) In page 7, under image classification, the author should indicate the results of overall accuracy assessment for 1986, 2001 and 2012 image classifications. Accuracy assessment is mandatory in image classification. It shows how accurately the classified image represents the reality on the ground. c) Figure 1. Yandev: LANDSAT TM (1986) on page 7 is not clear/legible for interpretation. It also lacks a legend, and is very small in size. It should be revised. The Figure cannot be Figure 1, yet we have Map 3.2 in page 5. Be consistent in naming of figures/maps. d) The author should only have 3 classified images (1986, 2001 and 2012) to avoid mixed up in analysis. Analysis should be limited on these three epochs. e) To avoid further mixed-up/confusion, I suggest that analysis of the extent of land use change should be specific in the following order: • 1986 versus 2001, • 2001 versus 2012. • 1986 versus 2012 The analysis on page 10-11 titled, Trend of the Land use/Landover in Yandev Forest Reserve (1986, 2001 and 2012), is therefore repetitive and not necessary as they should be discussed as listed above.	b) Table 1 Titled "Specifications of Satellite Imageries Used" is inserted to take care of the issue c) Accuracy assessment is mandatory in image classification. see table 2 d) the Fig. is expanded, it is change to Fig. 3, the issue of naming figures is also addressed. For the legend the fig. is a raw data, hence cannot be legend. f) it has being taking care of see tables 3-5
Minor REVISION comments	a) For a more current analysis, the current satellite image (if available) for 2017 or 2018 should have been used. This is because a lot of changes could have taken place between 2012 and 2018. b) On page 5 (Map 3.2), the spatial extent of the Yandev Forest is not clear. Practically, the forest cannot be perfectly rectangular. A revision should be made so that the exact location of the forest is illustrated. This should be obtained by overlaying the shape file with the satellite image indicating the area covered by the forest c) Figure . Yandev: LANDSAT ETM 2001, page 8, has no Figure number. It also lacks a legend. Correct this. d) In page 9, the second Figure has no caption. It has also not been classified. It also lacks a legend. e) On page 5 (Map 3.2), the correct procedure for organising a legend is that the points come first, followed by lines and polygons in that order. This should be corrected in all Maps. f) On page 5 (Map 3.2), what is LGA. This must first be written in full before abbreviation g) On page 7, the author should be consistent in labelling of maps. Either call them Figures or Maps, but not a mixture of both. h) On page 3, under materials and methods (study area), the author should cite the source of such background information. These include, but not limited to source of population data (536,068), coordinates. i) On page 4, the author should state where the Nigeria shape file that was used to derive Figure 3.1 was sourced from. The same applies to Map 3.2 Nigeria shapefile ArcGIS cannot be academically cited as an authority. An authority may only be a person or an institution j) Figure 4:3 Yandev LANDSAT TM Classified Image, correct the legend, "Degraded_Forest" by removing the hyphen k) The author (s) should ensure that all cited literature are listed under references and	a) We agree with the suggestion , however, it will give room for further studies b) it is addressed c) it is given the number, also it is a raw data, hence cannot be legend. d) Issues are addressed e). All Maps have been corrected. f) LGA is defined on line 65 g) all the maps are now referred to as figure h& i) the issues addressed All the issues are addressed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	vice versa. l) The author should in the conclusion state the policy implications of findings. For example, what are the implications of change in forest cover in the study area? Monitoring using GIS and planting more trees may not provide a long term solution if key stakeholders are not involved.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author (s) should edit the entire document to improve on grammar. The author (s) should ensure that maps are numbered/labelled consistently. The paper should be accepted if these corrections are made.	The article has been reviewed

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> NO.	