

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_100649
Title of the Manuscript:	GEOLOGIC STRUCTURES AND MINERALIZED PRECAMBRIAN PEGMATITE VEINS IN PARTS OF IGARRA SCHIST BELT SOUTHWESTERN NIGERIA.
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1) the theme addressed in the manuscript is important for the community except that the study does not take into account a number of elements</p> <p>2) The title of the article is not appropriate for the content. Proposal: Petrographic and structural study of Precambrian pegmatite veins in the Igarra schist belt, southwestern Nigeria</p> <p>3) The summary is understandable but lacks some details. Namely, they must situate the study area, then pose the problem that leads them to deal with this topic; tell the means used to reach the results before giving the major results of the study</p> <p>4) The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, but deserves to be better organized In the materials and methods subsection 2.1. Field work Here, the authors should state what materials they worked with to obtain the data 2.2. Laboratory work Likewise, give the laboratory materials used to make the thin sections and to do the modal analysis etc it is rather 1.GEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND instead of 1.1.GEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND</p> <p>5) the article is very simplistic, but the scientific approach is present</p> <p>6) not for the moment</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	I think for the language it should be fine	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This paper discusses the structural setting and modal analysis of Precambrian pegmatite veins that are mineralized in parts within the Igarra Schist Belt. However, the structural context of the study area is not discussed, so the order of emplacement (NE structures are related to which phase of deformation in the study area: litho-structural mapping of pegmatite veins) of the pegmatite veins cannot be given. Furthermore, the data presented does not show any mineralization potential. It is rather a petrographic and structural study of the pegmatite veins of Igarra. The discussion is very simple and deserves to be reviewed. The authors would benefit from discussing the local structural and petrographic context of the pegmatite veins in relation to the larger context of the Igarra shale belt or much larger in other areas. Some comments are directly in the text.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ouiya Pascal
Department, University & Country	Ecole Normale Supérieure, Burkina Faso