



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/1696
Title of the Manuscript:	Adapting Nigeria Cities to Climate Change using Design Options. A Review.

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected' if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	The attempt to discuss the issue of climate change (which is in fact a vast topic), is highly appreciated. In general the paper discusses design options at 3 levels in an urban environment. It would be desirable if this in relation to the Nigerian cities quoted with appropriate examples. As the title talks about the context of Nigeria, but it has been completely missed out expect for the mention of the Nigerian cities problems.	
Specific comments:	There needs to be a revision in terms of English and sentence construction. There is a need to form a framework of writing paper, where one section will guide us to the other section as we are reading. The overall storyline of the paper is missing. There is a little abrupt switch over to the titles. Methodology needs to be elaborated.	
Title and abstract	As stated earlier, the title and abstract are relevant to each other but the paper in general does not go in context to the case of Nigerian cities in specific. It has to be supported with facts and figures in context from time to time in paper.	
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	Problem statements needs to be defined in more clear words and needs to be little more specific. Objective of the study is clearly stated, but only the specific context of the scenario generation with respect to Nigerian cities is missed out. If I have to score originality I would rate it 5 out of 10.	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	Well references need to be worked on little more. Some of the references are quoted incorrectly; the referencing system at the end needs to be in one format for all the references. Secondly at some places sentences are directly stated from the article, which either needs to be in quotations or are needed to be reframed. The latter half of the paper hardly contains any references. As this is a literature review paper, there is a need for complete referencing.	
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	The methodology is not at all clearly stated. It need s a flow chart or explanation as to how do u arrive at the conclusion starting from the research. Secondly the conceptual framework, also just contains the literature, but does not talk about the framework of the paper. This shall need a through revision.	
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and	1. Data sources are not utilized properly. 2. Yes, author misses the references heavily. Though some sections contain good references, but majority part of the	



SDI Review Form 1.5

conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	paper misses detail referencing. 3. Discussions and conclusions are not completely based on facts and figures. In fact most of the discussions or design strategies lack the facts and figures and at places, illustrations are most appropriate, are also missing completely. 4. No, statistical analysis is not must, but as a research alternative may or may not be included.	
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	-Nil-	
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	No absolutely not. The conclusion carries many points which are not discussed in the paper. I have highlighted these parts in the paper. Secondly the conclusions have to be based on authors research work, which in this case is the "suggestion of Design Strategies", but in the conclusions provided, there are references quoted for concluding remarks, not in an appropriate manner, giving an impact of non original concluding remarks.	
References	Referencing system is not uniform. More references need to be quoted.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Neha Bansal
Department, University & Country	Department of Architecture and Planning, Indian Institute of Technology, Roorkee, India