



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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>The aim and research questions are not concrete enough, if the researcher is investigating any recreational facilities in relation to forests, or if a more social question is incorporated such as reflecting on the social groups using the centers investigated, as they all seem highly privatized and targeting certain social groups.</p> <p>Theoretical review is not well structured to address the different parts in focus. It kept the introduction image with reflection on some literature. However, it should be dealt with more thoroughly and within the framework of the case in Nigeria</p> <p>If the aim is to raise and emphasize the added value on levels, social, economic, cultural and so on, this would enrich the paper theoretically and in the results and discussion, finding synergies between them and target better use and function and increasing the number of visitors as well as the duration of the visits. However, more should be written and discussed on these levels to pave road for the fieldwork discussion</p> <p>Frequency of the visitors' typologies differs in other settings in the world. As in much literature, the majority of park visitors are older generation. It is interesting to discuss the differences so as to situate the city within the international discourse.</p>	<p>All visitors to the recreational sites were interviewed not a selected social group</p> <p>This was already addressed, See lines 40 – 45</p> <p>The work centred on appraisal of existing sites as opined by the visitors only</p> <p>See lines 112 – 115 for similar reports from Iran and Pakistan already discussed</p>
Minor REVISION comments	A justification of the five locations should be done and included in the selection of the cases and describing the problems of the cases addressed in the paper... this issue is missing	See lines 91 - 93
Optional/General comments		

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)	