

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_98341
Title of the Manuscript:	Sub-environments of Deposition and Facies Characteristics of the Nyaba River in Enugu Metropolis Southeastern 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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. I don't think this paper has gained a new geological understanding or established a new geological model.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. Abstract content is too detailed, systemic aspects need to be improved.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Most of the manuscript is correct, but most of it is generally accepted, and few new discoveries have been made.</p> <p>6. Most of the references are very old and it's inadequate. Part 2.0 is too simple and needs more detail about your method. In Fig.3, isn't the channel lag sediment at the bottom of the channel? In Fig.5, the direction of point bar migration is wrong. It is going in the opposite direction. In Fig.6, The facies succession of Meandering river is generally accepted. Is there any special of the Nyaba Meandering River?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>In Part 1.1, descriptions that are not relevant to this article can be deleted. Fig. 1 is not clearly enough. Fig.2 is a bit rough, lacks the necessary scale and illustration, and is unclear in its meaning. The three images are not meant to note the location, but more to reflect the geological phenomenon. Fig.7,8,9 in this article are irregular and vary in size.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The research method is not detailed, and the research content is not enough to support the conclusions. It is suggested to further increase the evidence, further systematic analysis, and strive to obtain new geological understanding or establish a new geological model.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dongdong Wang
Department, University & Country	College of Earth Science and Engineering, Shandong University of Science and Technology, China