



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_48583
Title of the Manuscript:	SPATIAL ASSESSMENT OF LAND SURFACE TEMPERATURE AND EMISSIVITY IN THE TROPICAL LITTORAL CITY OF PORT HARCOURT, 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/sdi-general-editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>KEYWORDS: The keywords must be in lower cases with exception of Port Harcourt (see line 19 of the reviewed manuscript).</p> <p>FIGURES: The Figure one should be rephrase to read thus: Figure 1: Rivers State showing Port Harcourt and Environment. Also, the author(s) must separate Figures from Titles using appropriate punctuation marks (using the Figure 3 as an example for others as corrected in the reviewed manuscript).</p> <p>Methods: Some ambiguities are observed in Figures 4 and 5 where the author(s) deals with land cover in 2001 and 2016; but in Figures 7, 8, 9, and 10 emphases are on wet season and dry season without years.</p> <p>CONCLUSION: The conclusion is too long. Author(s) should break it to three paragraphs as indicated in the corrected manuscript. Such correction will enhance the communication of the major findings.</p> <p>REFERENCES: The format used in the reference section is not in compliance to Vancouver style that Science Domain and IJCC approved. Appropriate corrections and examples has been effected and shown in the corrected manuscript (see from lines 347 to 409).</p>	<p>Keywords: corrected as suggested</p> <p>Figures: Figure 1 was re-captioned as suggested and the punctuation mark inserted in the other remaining figures as instructed</p> <p>Methods: Figures 4 and 5 were used to present the changes in the land cover between 2001 and 2017. The other figures 7,8 9 and 10 emphasized dry season and wet season because the data used were collected in January (dry Season) and August (Wet Season) of same year 2017 as presented in Table 1</p> <p>Conclusion: Done as corrected</p> <p>References: Done according to the Vancouver Style approved by the journal</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Few incidences of grammar and sentence structure e.g. lines 339 etc.	
Optional/General comments	This is a very good manuscript. However, the author(s) need to clarify the identified ambiguities and flaws for enhance communication and publication.	

PART 2:



SDI Review Form 1.6

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>