

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOGER_102860
Title of the Manuscript:	Recruiting the Very Low Frequency Electromagnetic Geophysical Technique for the analysis of Tunnel Erosion: A Case Study of Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines 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/AJOGER/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)
<p>Compulsory 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is novelty and technically sound.</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable for the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive enough for this article.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of this manuscript are well-defined.</p> <p>Based on my speciality in Geology, I do reckon that the manuscript is scientifically correct and in line with best practice.</p> <p>Yes, the references are very sufficient with the quality of the manuscript written.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language is partially suitable for scholarly communication. However, I have corrected every part of the language that is incorrect.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically good.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kingsley Chukwuebuka Chiadikobi
Department, University & Country	University of Aberdeen, United Kingdom