

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JGEESI_103578</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>REVIEW OF GULLY EROSION IN ANAMBRA STATE: CAUSES, EFFECTS, CONTROL MEASURES AND CHALLENGES ASSOCIATED WITH ITS MITIGATION</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Minireview Article</b>

### **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.journalgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes, we could know about the gally problems and the background in Nigeria. However, there are not so much scientific information.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes, but there are not so much scientific information.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Yes. Good number for a mini-review.</b></p> <p><b>As I wrote above, this review provides a chance to know about the gally problems in Nigeria. But there are not so much scientific information. It is better to add more scientific data in the manuscript. Plus, it is better to describe how the gally problem is serious in SE Nigeria using number/data using one section at the top. The resolution of Fig 1 and 2 is too low to read. Better to use/make a better one. It is also better to arrange by order for references. eg. “.. width exceeding tens of kilometres, they would better be called canyon [5], [1], [3]. -&gt; [1], [3], [5]</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. English in MS should be improved. There are a lot of minor errors. In addition, the authors prefer to use parenthesis. eg. “Available literatures have clearly shown that the underlying geology ( Imo shale) exerts ....” However, the usage of parenthesis makes unclear the relationship of the term. in case of upper example, is the underlying geology Imo shade? If so, need to describe as “that the Imo shale, underlying geology around the region,”</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Koji Iwamoto</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Malaysia Japan International Institute of Technology, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia</b>