

**Akuto Akpedze Konou**

PhD Candidate at École  
Polytechnique Fédérale de  
Lausanne (EPFL)  
Phone: +41 77 510 64 52  
Email: [akuto.konou@epfl.ch](mailto:akuto.konou@epfl.ch)

**Reviewer 2**

Urban Science

6th October 2023

Dear Reviewer 2,

New title: Reviewing two decades of literature on architects' and urban planners' contribution to urban agriculture and health research in Africa (2000-2020)

Thank you for considering our paper submission and to have reviewed it.  
Please find attached our round 1 reviewed manuscript

We received excellent suggestions from all the reviewers and took them on board. Please find on the following pages the responses to the reviewers.

We hope that the modifications improve the value of our manuscript and are open to any new suggestions.

Thank you for your time in considering this submission. We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Akuto Akpedze Konou  
Corresponding author

# For review article

## Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

### 1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions highlighted in the re-submitted files.

| 2. Questions for General Evaluation                                                      | Reviewer's Evaluation | Response and Revisions                                                                                                                                                   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references? | Must be improved      | <i>Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have improved it and specified the details in the point-by-point response table below.</i> |
| Are all the cited references relevant to the research?                                   | Must be improved      | <i>Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have improved it and specified the details in the point-by-point response table below.</i> |
| Is the research design appropriate?                                                      | Must be improved      | <i>Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have improved it and specified the details in the point-by-point response table below.</i> |
| Are the methods adequately described?                                                    | Must be improved      | <i>Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have improved it and specified the details in the point-by-point response table below.</i> |
| Are the results clearly presented?                                                       | Must be improved      | <i>Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have improved it and specified the details in the point-by-point response table below.</i> |
| Are the conclusions supported by the results?                                            | Must be improved      | <i>Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have improved it and specified the details in the point-by-point response table below.</i> |

### 3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Comments 1:</b> From the title of this manuscript, it is important that authors modify the title by specifying the kind of review. From my observation, it is more like a bibliometric analysis-type of review though it didn't follow the guidelines for a review of this kind.                          |
| <b>Response 1:</b> <i>Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have changed the title to: "Reviewing two decades of literature on architects' and urban planners' contribution to urban agriculture and health research in Africa (2000-2020)" – page 1, and line 2-4.</i> |
| <b>Comments 2:</b> Please, kindly rewrite the abstract section, salient findings were conspicuously missing.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>Response 2:</b> <i>Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have revised the abstract adding the missing results – page 1, lines 11-24.</i>                                                                                                                             |
| <b>Comments 3:</b> The introduction was not well articulated. In my own opinion, the urban agriculture should be linked directly to food and nutrition security while health outcomes should be generated from it and not the opposite.                                                                      |
| <b>Response 3:</b> <i>Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have restructured the introduction so that urban agriculture is directly linked to food and nutrition security while health outcomes are generated:</i><br>- Paragraph 1 talks about UA generalities        |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Paragraph 2 talks about UA and food security</li> <li>- Paragraph 3 talks about UA and Public Health</li> </ul> <p>(Page 1,2, Lines 29-62)</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| <p><b>Comments 4: The background information for this study was not well presented. The knowledge gap(s) was not well articulated.</b></p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| <p><b>Response 4:</b> Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have restructured the introduction into 4 different parts: historical background, contemporary relevance, Problematic and gaps, and the research objectives – pages 1 and 2, lines 28, 42, 52, and 84. We have also restructured the introduction, added a paragraph about the problematic, and distinguished each objective with dashes. – page 2, lines 97-103. Finally, we have added the 3 points to the article: Why is it timeliness to explore such a study? What makes this study different from other studies in the world? We have also stated how the findings are different from prior academic studies that were conducted elsewhere, if any? – page 2, lines 70, 75, 81, 82.</p> |
| <p><b>Comments 5: From the methods, why was the search terminated in December 2020? I believe incredible papers can be extracted within 2021-2023 that can improve the results of this study.</b></p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| <p><b>Response 5:</b> Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we would like to explain that the data collection of this research was done until December 2020, then Ph.D. field work trips were carried out by the principal author, and then data analysis was carried out in 2022, and submission was possible in 2023.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <p><b>Comments 6: In line 74, what's the meaning of "as le"? What do you mean by "4portals outcome synthesised" in fig.1? The final number of included publications is missing in fig. 1.</b></p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <p><b>Response 6:</b> Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have removed the "as le" and the title "'4portals outcome synthesised" and added the final number of included publications – page 3, line 125.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| <p><b>Comments 7: In line 157-159, what's the number of publications from Google scholar from your search procedures?</b></p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <p><b>Response 7:</b> Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have added that the number of Google Scholar publications gathered is n=150 publications – page 5, line 177.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <p><b>Comments 8: In line 173-174, why the affiliations of authors from Scopus database excluded? What is the total number of extracted publications in this stage?</b></p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <p><b>Response 8:</b> Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we would like to specify that we have excluded Scopus in some studies because it was tedious work that one person could not do manually according to the number of publications. The total at this stage was 390 publications. Thank you again.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <p><b>Comments 9: In line 198, why the inconsistency in reporting your results? If you know some databases may not provide suitable or usable results, you may stick to fewer databases or just only one reliable database usually Scopus or web of science.</b></p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| <p><b>Response 9:</b> Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, like in the previous comment, we would like to specify that we have excluded Scopus in some studies because it was tedious work that one person could not do manually according to the number of publications. The total at this stage was 390 publications. Thank you again.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Comments 10:</b> In line 259-267, you excluded papers from Google scholar database again.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <b>Response 10:</b> <i>Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, like in the previous comment, we would like to specify that we have excluded Scopus in some studies because it was tedious work that one person could not do manually according to the number of publications. The total at this stage was 390 publications. Thank you again.</i>                                                                   |
| <b>Comments 11:</b> This review did not follow the basic guidelines of a bibliometric review. You can not use excel to create your mapping that will suit this kind of review. Use software like VOSviewer or Bibliometrix using R software. There are so many others but the two are commonly used. It is highly recommended that authors use any of these software for this study. The real bibliographical mappings are not generated in Excel. |
| <b>Response 11:</b> <i>Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have precised that the maps are obtained using QGIS 3.32.2 – page 4, line 135, and page 11, line 271, 279.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |

#### 4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language

**Point 1:** Needs some basic language editing and formatting of figures.

**Response 1:** Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have used MDPI's English editing department services to check and correct the English of this second manuscript version before resubmitting it.

#### 5. Additional clarifications

*None.*