

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_95982
Title of the Manuscript:	Structural Analysis of the Bagoué furrow (South Boundiali): fracturing, kinematics and chronology
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://journalajoger.com/index.php/AJGER/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, Advanced techniques like Remote Sensing and GIS are used in the present work, which will elaborate their applications to the new researchers. Yes Minor modifications needed in with the addition of reason why this work has been takenup. Yes Little additions needed Yes 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Needed revision in some places (details given below)</p> <p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> First sentence of the abstract reads "... spatial imagery is an important technique in controlling lineament fracture networks." - Need to be corrected as spatial imagery does not control the lineament fractures, but it just provide information. Why you did the present study, needed also be justified in the abstract. <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Need consistency in using certain words, for example "Spatial imagery" – at places it is mentioned as "Remote Sensing data" while, in some places "satellite images". <p>Study area and Geological context</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There is confusion in the name of the study area, whether it is "Bagoue furrow" or Bagoue Trench" <p>Materials and Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Geographical Information System software are ArcGIS, QGIS etc, Envi 4.7, PCI's Geomaticaetc., are image processing software – the author has mixed both. <p>Results and Discussion NIL</p> <p>Extraction of Lineaments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4th sentence in the text "... Detected lineaments is very loaded" is need to be corrected. Maps are sufficient and good <p>Directional Statistical Analysis of the Lineament Maps</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Well explained. <p>Control and validation of Lineaments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Well explained. Diagrams are good and sufficient. <p>Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Well explained <p>Conclusions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Good and sufficient <p>References</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient. <p>The above comments are minor things, but give wrong perception</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	to the readers especially to non-geology readers.	
Optional/General comments	Overall the manuscript is good, could be considered for publication with slight revisions which provided separately.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	K. Raghu Babu
Department, University & Country	Yogi Vemana University, India