



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	<p>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."</p> <p>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.)</p> <p>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)</p> <p>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.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Many typo mistakes; consistency of term (center/centre), symbol/special font (° ' " / latitude, longitude)	
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.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ariya Aruninta</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Chulalongkorn University, Thailand</i>