

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This is an interesting study and the authors have collected a unique dataset using cutting edge methodology. The paper is generally well written and structured. However, in my opinion the paper has some shortcomings in regard to some data analyses, and I feel this unique dataset has not been utilized to its full extent. The extent of different flood vulnerability levels was expressed in km². I feel the paper could be better if the authors present the results in ha rather than km².</p> <p>A detailed "Supplementary Information" section might be useful and could help to keep the manuscript in a short format. Authors can replace some tables in the SI.</p> <p>Overall, the title, abstract and the whole paper are well-written, concise and comprehensive. The manuscript is scientifically correct and has novelty. The authors tried to find out the existing literatures about the concept which made the paper more interesting.</p> <p>The references provided here are more than sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes with some minor corrections	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	There are lack of uniformity regarding the font type. For e.g. the authours wrote <i>et al.</i> , in some places and in other places they used et al., (not italic). There should be consistency throughout the manuscript.	

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tazeen Fatima Khan
Department, University & Country	University of Dhaka, Bangladesh