

Paper: “Spatial and Temporal Analysis: A GIS-Based Application Tool for Crime Monitoring and Clustering in Malawi”

Submitted: 02 January 2023

Accepted: 11 March 2024

Published: 31 March 2024

Corresponding Author: Chitani Jarves Bob Tobias

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n8p167](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n8p167)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Itumeleng Letsolo
Africa Nazarene University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Itumeleng Letsolo	
University/Country: ANU	
Date Manuscript Received: 30 th January	Date Review Report Submitted: 3 rd February 2023
Manuscript Title: Spatial and Temporal Analysis: A GIS-Based Application Tool for Crime Monitoring and Clustering in Malawi	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is clear and precise</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>The abstract missed information relating to methods used which are covered in the body of the article. in the body of the report, the writer mentioned that network analysis technique was used but that is not mentioned anywhere in the abstract. The results and problem state are vague and there is a need to revisit the abstract to include missing items</i> <i>One would expect to see the study delimitations highlighted in the paper.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are hanging sentences and grammatical mistakes together with inconsistent formatting of the paper. In some instance there is a space after a paragraph wherelse in some instances there is no space thus leaving the paper clusted and not presentable. There are instanced where some texts are way out of margin in the bibliography session.</i> <i>The bibliography also has to be revisited to align with best practice.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>the method is briefly explain however there is a room for improvement. Selection of the method is not motivated (basis for selection of the said method is not highlighted)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Results are clear and well tabulated to inform recommendations made</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The Conclusion is comprehensiove and recommendations are clearly stated.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Bibliography items are out of margin in some instances</i> <i>Writer urged to check the acceptable format of the Bibliography and apply to the whole section.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Proof read the article ones more and work on consistent formatting

Improve the abstract by also incorporating the method of analysis used and a broader summary of findings and recommendations

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: