



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:	Paper needs significant rework, adding a critical review of how overall knowledge applies to the local Nigerian context	
Specific comments:	See comments below.	
Title and abstract	Title: this suggests a focus on Nigerian cities. However, the material provided seems much more generic; there is very little mention of the specific situation in Nigeria. Either change the title, or (better) introduce the local constraints into the work. Approach contains aim - move this to the problem statement. At the same time, try to define a more specific aim; this one is extremely broad/vague.	
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	The problem of climate change is described, but is not novel. The reviewer lacks the objective – again, bring in the specific situation in Nigeria, pressing needs, and formulate the aim/objective clearly. In the conclusions, come back to this aim to ensure the paper is well rounded.	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	For a review paper, the number of references quotes is too low – try to double. There is an abundance of material out there – for instance the recent work by Katie Williams and her group in Bristol, UK; or Monjour Mourshed and Rohinton Emmanuel who deal with adaptation in a tropical context.	
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)	This paper is a literature review. The approach is ok, but given that it is a review paper much more references are needed. For instance, the way the paper is written it looks like all design strategies A to I are taken from Shaw et al (2007) – is that the case? Can you not underpin with other cross references?	
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and 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?)	Robustness of data – lit review results only. References – weak, needs more underpinning. Discussion and conclusion – it is not clear what this paper adds to the existing body of knowledge in this area Statistical analysis: not applicable.	
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No ethical or competing interest issues have been found	



SDI Review Form 1.5

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)	Again, the conclusions are open-ended and seem to add little to the existing body of knowledge. I would suggest to include a more specific aim for the paper, focussing on the Nigerian situation, and then critically assess the literature for application to the local context. Without that I do not believe this paper to 'fly'.	
References	In current form the paper only has 22 references, which is insufficient for a serious review article.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dr Pieter de Wilde
Department, University & Country	Environmental Building Group Plymouth University United Kingdom