

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JGEESI_95935</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Mapping of aquifer potential in the Northeast basement rock of Burkina Faso</b>
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.journalgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy> )

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><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> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, potential of aquifer can be identify and could be significant groundwater reserved.</p> <p>Mapping of aquifer potential in the Northeast basement rock of Burkina Faso Using remote sensing and geophysical method</p> <p>Should add any novelty from this research and what are the impact of the research?</p> <p>Need to revise</p> <p>Yes but still can improve</p> <p>So far OK</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Should be OK	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. Should be 1 paragraph only in the abstract</p> <p>2. Need to add the problem statement in the abstract</p> <p>3. Should add novelty from this research and what are the impact/contribution of the research in the abstract?</p> <p>4. Should explain in resistivity subtopic and more detail explanation</p> <p>5. Better to have research methodology flowchart</p> <p>6. The interpretation is too general, should describe in detail relate with quantitative and qualitative analysis.</p> <p>7. Explain what is the research contribution in the conclusion?</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nordiana Mohd Muztaza</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Physics, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia</b>