

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_100511
Title of the Manuscript:	Disaster Response and Recovery Practices among Oil Spill Impacted Communities in Selected States in Niger Delta Region, Nigeria
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community due to the investigation of the disaster response and recovery practices among oil spill impacted communities.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is clear and completed. The objectives, methodology, results and conclusions are clear.</p> <p>4. The article is well written and easy to understand.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references of the article are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>The introduction should be improved. Studies related to the topic of the article must be added. Furthermore, the objective of the paper must be presented in the introduction.</p> <p>The data analysis should be better described.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The article is well written and easy to understand.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Celina Kakitani Ofuchi
Department, University & Country	Multiphase Flow Research Center, Federal University of Technology of Parana, Brazil