

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_104268
Title of the Manuscript:	A critique of the triangle method and a version suitable for use in the field by the non- specialist
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The presented manuscript represents a commendable addition to the scientific community. Its core proposition of devising a method called the "right triangle method," with the explicit objective of catering to non-specialists, demonstrates a laudable step in the desired trajectory. The potential for heightened usability inherent in this approach makes it a noteworthy and promising contribution to the field.</p> <p>Yes, the article title is suitable.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract gives a brief overview of the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>Yes. Even though there were quite a number of references from the 1990s, the majority of the references were from the last 20 years.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript exhibits some shortcomings regarding the provision of references in certain sections. Notably, the introductory paragraph lacks appropriate citations to support the statements made. Additionally, in the second paragraph, the author refers to several works, but only one reference is provided, which is insufficient to substantiate the claims effectively. For enhanced credibility and to strengthen the scholarly foundation of the work, it is recommended to include at least three relevant references in the second paragraph. Ensuring proper referencing throughout the manuscript will bolster its academic integrity and contribute to a more robust and well-supported research output.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Precious Obiako
Department, University & Country	Baylor University, United States