



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT’S on revised paper (if any)	Authors’ response to editor’s comments
<p>My comments below:</p> <p>1. Abstract should follow a clear logic, beginning with the context, the aim of the study, methods employed, key results and conclusion. This is missing.</p> <p>2. Introduction is very weak. It does not show historical, contextual and conceptual issues related to urban growth. This should be clearly discussed before narrowing down to what the study sought to address. In other words, it is not clear from the introduction what the study is investigation, why such an investigation is necessary and the potential role of the research in bridging knowledge gap on this subject.</p> <p>3. The materials and methods is not clear. Even if data was obtained from secondary sources, the logic behind the data, and the collection process needs to be made clear.</p> <p>4. Results are loaded with maps. But not adequately interpreted. The changes should be discussed and linked to broader concepts or literature on urban growth.</p> <p>5.It is not clear how the study contribute to the broader scientific knowledge on urban development. The conclusion should show this clearly.</p>	<p>Abstract has been revised</p> <p>Changes have been incorporated as far as possible.</p> <p>Changes have been incorporated as far as possible.</p> <p>As the study aims to show the spatio-temporal change maps were required. Some changes have been included.</p> <p>Some changes have been included.</p>