

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_100509
Title of the Manuscript:	Flood Vulnerability Assessment of Communities in Akwa Ibom, 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><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></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes it serves to raise the awareness of the vulnerability status of the communities in flood prone res using modern tools –GIS and RS</p> <p>2. The title is okay</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive but too wordy. The author could reduce up to 200-250 words.</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes it is scientifically correct. To make it visible, the author could state in the first sentences of the abstract why this study is important in the science of the current time.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient and current.</p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS</b></p> <p>-Research gap is not visible as to why this study has been conducted</p> <p>-Vulnerability model/framework is not articulated. Will be worth for the author to be broadened by the vulnerability progression model by Blaikie (1994) showing the underlying, dynamic and unsafe conditions of the communities of Akwa Ibom, Nigeria linking them with the variables the author has used to infer the vulnerability status.</p> <p>-Additionally, the variables that the author has used to assess should be stated where they are from? The framework or authors creation?</p> <p>-The reasons for the choice of study area are not in the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	YES	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Japhet Ringo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Dodoma, Tanzania</b>