



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 discusses the interesting resettlement scheme at Apo. The study explains the resettlement process and its sustainability using adaptation strategies human, natural, financial, physical and social capital. This is interesting in that it makes a case for either success or challenges faced by this resettlement project. However the paper is greatly weakened by following: First, typically introduction has anywhere from one sentence to a full paragraph describing the following: What we know about the topic, what remains unknown (the research problem), how the research is going to address the problem, the contribution of the paper to the related literature, the findings, analysis/discussions and conclusions. Second, the author(s) needs to give a brief but clear historical background as to what happened that lead to the idea or policies of resettlement. I.e. why resettle people? Give the readers a clear roadmap. It took me the entire paper to look out for "why the resettlement"? The author(s) don't state the purpose/objectives of the paper until page 18 in the summary of results of findings (this is misplaced). The objectives should be with the introduction at the beginning of the paper. Reviewers/readers need to know immediately the research question(s), and the objectives/purpose of the	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	paper. The author(s) should always have in mind that the readers (reviewers) know nothing about Nigeria and the resettlement program. Therefore a need for thorough explanation and discussion to convince the reader/reviewer. Yes the author(s) mention on page1 that “the resettlement has been undertaken since the colonial era for a variety of situations and objectives (Dare, 2004).” What are the situations? It is not clear from the literature review if the author(s) meant the projects that emerged on page 3 lead to displacement of the population and thus their resettlement. If so then clearly explain. Third, the research question is not clear (vague). The research question seems to address the idea that the resettlement programs were having challenges but again without a proper and extensive background this does not resonate very well with the analysis of this paper. The research questions on page 4 do not address the fundamental question of how all this problems arose in the first place. Lastly, the paper needs restructuring i.e. paragraph 2 on page 4 should be moved to discussion or conclusion. The study area on page 4 is good but should be moved to the introduction of this paper or to the literature review. But still this falls short of the objectives of the paper.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The paper needs edits based on repeated words like “hence” on page 3. The author(s) refers to Wikipedia as source on page 6 (serious academic work does not rely of Wikipedia)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Danvas Mabeya</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Arts and Sciences, Southeast Community College, U.S.A</i>