

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_131337
Title of the Manuscript:	Suitability Assessment of SRTM and ASTER GDEM2 Digital Elevation Model for Terrain Analysis in Aba North: A Case Study of Abia state polytechnic Aba.
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The authors examine two different DEM sources, namely SRTM and ASTER GDEM2, and their reliability for terrain modeling utilizing ArcGIS 10.5 software. The study applied some statistical metrics such as Mean error, Root Mean Square Error, and correlation coefficient for comparative and fitness analysis. Understanding the accuracy and usefulness of DEMs in local contexts is crucial for enhancing decision-making, especially as their various uses grow. By comparing these widely used global DEM datasets, this study contributes valuable insight into their strengths and limitations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)	Reliability Assessment of SRTM and ASTER GDEM2 Digital Elevation Model for Terrain Analysis in Aba North: A Case Study of Abia state polytechnic Aba.	This research investigates which of the DEMs is more suitable for terrain analysis within the study area. Therefore, I prefer the word suitability than reliability as the reviewer recommend. Reliable may turn the focus of the research as one may see it to as the use of reliable approach. Then if that the case why is it reliable compared to other methods?
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive enough.	
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	(1) The article contains several typographical errors that must be corrected. (2) The authors fail to define majority of the acronyms in this study (3) Are there no previous similar studies in this area? Why are the authors silent about them? (4) What is the size of the study area (km²) considered in this study (5) The authors need to scientifically provide justification for the randomly selected points. (6) The authors are encouraged to mathematically represent the statistical metrics employed in this research for an in-depth understanding of the methodology.	All these lapses has been addressed has been addressed
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not sufficient, and the author needs to review similar work in this area while emphasizing their research contributions. Here is a suggested paper: Ibrahim, M., & Islam, S. M. R. (2011). Digital terrain modeling for natural hazard assessment: A comparative analysis.	This has been addressed

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Typos are there in a few places, which can be rectified. Also, improve the clarity of some of your statements e.g. "SRTM DEM of 1-arcsecond (30-m) which is being made publicly available through, the United States Geological Survey's EarthExplorer site was as used for this study".	This has been adressed
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	