

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_94027
Title of the Manuscript:	Spatial Assessment of Flood Vulnerability of Developed Properties in Port Harcourt Metropolis, Rivers State, Nigeria
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:

(<https://www.journaljgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This article is good overall even though there is still some fine-tuning to be done. The introductory paragraph for instance is good enough for the trash bin as it is surplus to requirement. The author can do himself a lot of good by taking that off. 2. I think the author has not served himself well by using some words interchangeably. For the record the author had pencilled down "Developed Properties (DP)" as a key word to this research but has frequently interchanged "DP" with "buildings" and "houses" throughout the document. It is important to note that whilst houses are buildings, not all buildings are houses in an urban space. Thus, they should not be used interchangeably. For the sake of clarity, one would have hoped he uses DP throughout his document. 3. For an article of disaster and risk management meant for publication in an international journal, one would expect the author to employ the appropriate terminologies to suit the occasion. It is therefore strange that the author will choose "danger" instead of "risk" in his usage. Whilst this article is good overall, such minor blips can muddy the beauty of your work. A prove-reading exercise can work this one out. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author will need to re-consider his choice of words in some cases. For example, it would be more appropriate to say..." The relief is generally low-lying with average height of between 20m and 30m above sea level..." than ..." The relief is generally lowland which has an average of elevation between 20m and 30m above sea level..." 2. There is also the need to do proper prove-reading to regularize some of the grammatical and semantical errors in usage. It would be pretty embarrassing if it were your readers rather pointing out such everyday errors. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author will need to work on his abstract. Though there isn't much to do here you will still need to fine-tune some of the stuff in there. The part that talks about your results in absolute terms is unacceptable to me, and needs to be worked on. 2. Generally, the author has done a great job. I particularly admired his methodology as there is little to blame as far as I am concerned. 	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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:	David Baaman Laar
Department, University & Country	Kumbungu Senior High School, Ghana