

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_105863
Title of the Manuscript:	An Integrated Approach to the Investigation of groundwater potential in parts of Akuku-Toru Local Government Area, Rivers State, 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.journalspsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your paper is interesting, well organized, well written and high potential for publication on the journal. However, it needs some revision before accepting for publication. 2. No, it need some revision. Correct to “ Investigation of groundwater potential zone by using Geospatial Technology in Akuku-Toru Local Government Area, Rivers State, Nigeria” 3. Yes, but it is better if you add background of the study on the first line of abstract before aim section. 4. No. Study location should be included under materials and methods as sub section. 5. Yes 6. It is sufficient but author can improve the result and discussion by using the below paper. https://doi.org/10.2166/ws.2023.183 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. yes 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>-The necessity and innovation of the article should be improved to the end paragraph of the introduction part. - It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mitiku Badasa Moisa
Department, University & Country	Wollega University, Ethiopia