

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Geological Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJOGER_95311</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Permeability characteristics of lateritic soils from a dumpsite in Ado-Ekiti, Southwestern Nigeria</b>
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://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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b>  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. It provides information on material for landfill use. This material could be useful for proper implementation of disposal process. 2. The title does not flow with the content. The title could be modified thus: <b>Potential of lateritic soils as a liner in landfill: A Case Study of a dumpsite in Ado-Ekiti, Southwestern Nigeria.</b> 3. The abstract is moderate. It requires modifications provided in the manuscript. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript requires improved modification. They are not numbered. 5. The manuscript could be considered scientifically correct. However, it was poorly presented. 6. Most of the references are not recent. Where possible a more recent work should be used.  <b>The article should be resubmitted for review after all the observation and suggestions are effected.</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION comments</b> <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Language used is moderate. The article requires some amendment before publication.	
<b>Optional/General comments</b>	A lot of repetition and unnecessary information were added to make the work bulky. Such statement were suggested to be removed.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Mohammed, Abubakar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bayero University, Nigeria</b>