

**ReviewForm 1.7**

JournalName:	<b>JournalofGeography,Environmentand EarthScienceInternational</b>
ManuscriptNumber:	<b>Ms_JGEESI_115647</b>
TitleoftheManuscript:	<b>APPLICATIONOF AIRBORNE MAGNETIC DATA TO ASSESS THE STRUCTURE THAT FAVOURS GOLD MINERALIZATION WITHIN SOUTHERN PARTS OF KATSINA STATE, NIGERIA</b>
TypeoftheArticle	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that an author should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Yes, it is as it provides approaches and techniques to gold exploration approaches in Nigeria. The techniques are sound, economical and readily deployable.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, it does as it clearly correlates with the objectives of the article.</b></p> <p><b>The abstract is very succinct and summarises the main findings of the manuscript.</b></p> <p><b>The manuscript is well organized, easy to follow and with great fluidity in the spatial arrangement of the illustrative components.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, I think the results are supported by findings in the literature.</b></p> <p><b>The references are sufficient and current.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is well written.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is well presented and written. Therefore, deserves to be published. Some editorials suggestions are recommended before it can be published.</p>	

**ReviewForm 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Roger Saint-Fort</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mount Royal University, Canada</b>