

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_94126
Title of the Manuscript:	Resilient Infrastructure as a Panacea to Flooding in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaligeesi.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	<p>This manuscript presents a review focused on a set of recommendations for dealing with the resurgence of floods that cause indirect and indirect damage in Nigeria each year in rainy periods. However, it is not clear from the work how resilient infrastructure is an adequate solution to floods? This is interesting work, but it requires major amendments to give it a scientific character. In particular:</p> <p>In form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The document does not respect the approach of a scientific article namely: introduction - materials/method - results and/or discussion - conclusion. It seems to us that the material or methods section was omitted by the author(s) - In addition, the different sections should be numbered to provide clarity and facilitate reading of the manuscript. For example, we propose the following plan: <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1-Materials or Methods 2-Results and discussion 2-1- REASONS FOR FAILURE OF FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT IN NIGERIA 2-2- THE NEED FOR RESILIENCE INFRASTRUCTURE IN NIGERIA 3-Recommandations <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In the background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The research question and purpose of the article does not appear in the introduction. The author(s) should review the approach to the issue to make the document relevant. - Table 1 may be relevant if it is placed in the section entitled: FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT IN NIGERIA, while taking into account the comment above the table. <p>Although interesting to the scientific community of environmental sciences, the manuscript is not yet ready for publication, in my opinion. The author(s) should consider the suggested comments and resubmit for review.</p> <p>NB: Some suggested corrections were made to the manuscript</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adomon Abodou Athanase
Department, University & Country	Peleforo Gon Coulibaly University, Côte d'Ivoire