



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2013_AIR_8364
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Landuse/Landcover Change in Damaturu Town of Yobe State, Nigeria
Type of the 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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 12. Keywords. Choose appropriate keywords no included into the title of the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Lines 14-114. Introduction section. The introduction is too much long. There are many sentences without citation. In this section the text from lines 51 to 100 should be summarized into one or two paragraphs.</p> <p>Lines 193-295. Results and Discussion section. The discussion should be improved including other studies about this region and information (e.g., which crops can be identified as responsible for the landuse/landcover change from 1991-2009? What the proportion of populational increasing in each year studied?) Could a table or graphic to be used to show the relation between the populational rate increasing and built-up areas?)</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>This manuscript examines the dynamics of landuse/landcover change of Damaturu town from 1986 to 2009 using Remote Sensing and Geographic Information System techniques. The work is well executed, but it is not well referenced (e.g., Introduction section) and detailed (e.g., Discussion section).</p> <p>There are not ethical issues in this manuscript.</p>	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer