SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JGEESI_50864**
Title of the Manuscript:	**GREEN AREAS AND OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL CENTRES IN IBADAN, NIGERIA: AN APPRAISAL**
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)

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	I understand that the author(s) have good intention. But the results and discussion should be more scientific and relevant to the research objective; **"To investigate outdoor recreational *potentials and constraints* in relation to forestry in *five (different)* recreational sites."**	The potentials are described by the visitors attracted to the recreation sites (Table 1) and their willingness to pay for the ecosystem services provided by the sites (Fig. 2). Awareness of the various services is also potential identified.
	Especially the **five** cases study sites have diverse characteristics, some seem to be public (free entry), but the others are commercial (entry fee maybe charged, thus from this assumption, the study should discuss more in detail about the average expenses which also related to activities preferences (ie: strolling in the park is free and relax, learning in zoological park is worthy even though entry fee may apply, etc.)	There is no notable diverse in the characteristics of the study sites, all of them charge entry fees except the Polo club, which entry is based on membership annual dues. Hence, there is restriction on entrance into the club; entry is attached to affiliation to members. In all the sites, separate fees are usually not charged for individual activities but lump sum in most cases except swimming pool facility which enjoy special charges.
	The cross tab statistic methodology is fine, when the researcher(s) acquired the right research questions. The results on gender, age, spending, etc are NOT relevant to the objectives (*potentials and constraints, on different categories of outdoor recreational sites*)	The chi square portrayed socio status and knowledge of ecosystem benefits of respondents which is part of the potentials. The knowledge may be a point of attraction to the sites
		Percentage figures in Table 1 and the text have been reconciled
	Table 1 is NOT the same as the text (results in percentage of age groups). As a researcher, this is very important part of the paper, author(s) should avoid this kind of mistakes.	
Minor REVISION comments	Many typo mistakes; consistency of term (center/centre), symbol/special font (° ' ″ / latitude, longitude)	Center changed to centre in all the document
Optional/General comments	Since the **five** recreational sites are diverse. The author(s) may consider explaining the *potentials and constraints* of each site. These discussions can answer research questions more noticeable and it should be the focus and more significant finding of this research. Chi-square can be used to compare the respondents in each site.	The report based on the pooled data not individual sites

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	None