



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_35162
Title of the Manuscript:	An Assessment of the Sustainability of Resettlers Livelihood Assets in the Apo Resettlement Scheme of Abuja, Nigeria
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	• The paper is good and straight forward, but it can be shortening since there are a lot of tables, calculations and explanation that could have been omitted. Their presence in the paper somehow confuses the reader. E.g. the testing of the hypothesis. • The introduction section reads like the findings section, it pre-empt the paper and discourage the reader to continue. Unfortunately, the finding section is not as straight forward as it was in the introduction section. The section can be replaced accordingly. • Use of illustrations was not sufficiently utilized, there are a number of incidences that the author could have used a graph, or chart or any other illustration to present the findings and the analysis which could have been short and clear, instead the author tried to explain using text and sometimes numbers. • Conclusion usually comes after the summary and that's should be changed.	Noted and necessary corrections made.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• The author should consider checking some typographic errors and gramma within the text. • There are some unclear sentences, some read as unfinished and some are not understood at all; e.g. lines 103, 150, 190-191, 229, etc • The use of capital letters in line 242, should be checked and corrected accordingly.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• Why mixing percentages and actual numbers?! E.g. in line 244, Confusing somehow, choose one or find a way of explaining it either in brackets or footnotes, • In line 250, is 31.5% and 11.5% complete loss? Check and correct/explain. Make use of tables and graphs/charts to present your analysis within the discussion otherwise its boring and difficult to follow actual numbers. That's should end in the findings/result section. • There are some grammatical and typographic errors which need to be corrected: e.g. in line 287 replace "too" with "to", line 289 is not clear, need to be re-casted, line 349 resettles should be replaced with resettlers. • To shorten the paper, you can spare some unnecessary calculations to the reader, e.g. in line 295 you can do away with the calculations and go straight into explaining if the hypothesis was true of false.	
--	--	--

Comment [GP1]: Yes, 31.5% and 11.5% completely lost rock stones and their job earnings respectively.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Line 11 omit the word capita as its already in the beginning of the sentence Line 16: Replace the word “social capita assets” with “social capital” Line 16: replace the word personal assets with “physical assets” for better understanding Line 18 the sentence should begin with “Lack of livelihood enhancement resulted.....” Line 40 replace (lorliam, 2014) with (<i>ibid</i>) Consider to reduce numbers in your discussion and deal with one or two extreme cases that were found and not each and everything obtained in the findings Recommendations usually comes after the conclusion, but in this paper was the other way round	
---	---	--