

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JGEESI_96090  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Field and Petrographic Studies of the Guwahati metapelites, Assam, NE India: Evidence for Post- Metamorphic K-Metasomatism |
| 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.journaljgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/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) |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments<br>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b> | The manuscript is important to the scientific community looking at the problem it is trying to address.<br><br>The title is suitable. There is no need of any alteration.<br><br>The abstract needs a little review to make more comprehensive.<br><br>The subsections and the structure of the manuscript are not appropriately done. The section for reporting the findings should be appropriately positioned under Result.<br><br>I don't have any problem with the findings in the manuscript.<br><br>The references are mostly not recent but they are sufficient. There is need for the author to explore the most recent literature for references. |   |
| <b>Minor REVISION</b> comments<br>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>   | The English quality is fair. There is need for some correction of few grammatical errors.   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  |   |   |

### 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <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:                            | Musa Mohammad Tanko |
| Department, University & Country | Nigeria             |