

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AJOPACS_105632
Title of the Manuscript:	A Geo-Electric Survey of Potential Aquifer in some Parts of Amaigbo in Nwangele Local Government Area of Imo State, Using Vertical Electrical Sounding and Well Log Data.
Type of the Article	Short 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://journalajopacs.com/index.php/AJOPACS/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>The presented manuscript represents a commendable and significant addition to the scientific community. Its core proposition of using Vertical Electrical Sounding and Well Log Data in surveying aquifer depth and groundwater potential demonstrates a laudable step in groundwater exploration, aquifer remediations, and contaminant prevention in hydrology and geophysics.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract can be written such that the significance of the study is emphasized, and the result of the study is summarized with proper details of the methodology deployed. The first sentence is not fit to be included in the abstract and should be removed.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. The author needs to reorganize the structure and merge some subsections because they are mere repetitions. For instance, subsection 1.6, "literature review," can be included in the introduction. Also, subsections 1.2 and 1.3 are literally the same thing and should be merged; finally, more details about the study area can be discussed.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are not sufficient. This study was conducted in 2023; the most recent paper cited was in 2011. The author needs to do a literature review and include more recent findings from the study area if there are any.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication and understanding. However, many grammatical and typographical errors are committed in this manuscript. This clearly indicates a study conducted hurriedly without paying attention to details. I suggest the author revisit the manuscript and correct all spelling and grammar mistakes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Under subsection 3.2.2 VES Implication of Umuleke, the author referred to Table 2 in the first sentence; however, no table is presented in this manuscript. 2. Legend can be included in figure 1 to figure 5. 3. While legends were included in Figure 6 to Figure 12, the author needed to explain what SN and LN are, as those abbreviations were never used in the previous sections and subsections. 4. The resistivity values and layer thickness for each location, as discussed under subsections 3.2.1 to 3.2.12, can be summarized in a table for better understanding. 5. Below is the extract from the manuscript with sentences that are not relevant to the manuscript. <p>3.3 Correlation Between VES and Geophysical Well Logging</p> <p>Result of depth to aquifer in the study area from the vertical electrical sounding corresponds to the aquifer depth obtained from the geophysical well logging result. Result of the Geophysical well logging validate the electrical resistivity survey carried out in the study area which is an approximation confirming the best interval for screen placement for the borehole drilled within the</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	area for optimal yield and good groundwater development. This section may each be divided by subheadings or may be combined. A combined Results and Discussion section is often appropriate. This should explore the significance of the results of the work, don't repeat them. Avoid extensive citations and discussion of published literature only. The highlighted paragraph in red is part of section 3.3, but these sentences have nothing to do with what was discussed in this section.	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oluwaseun Joseph Akomolafe
Department, University & Country	Kansas State University, United States