

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_126734
Title of the Manuscript:	Contribution of spatial techniques to the identification of discontinuous basement aquifers in semi-arid zones: the case of the Precambrian basement of Damagaram-Mounio (Centre-East-Niger)
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The contribution of spatial techniques to the identification of discontinuous groundwater aquifers in semi-arid regions is significant. This study is important because it enhances our understanding of groundwater resources, which are crucial for sustainable water management in areas facing water scarcity. By utilizing advanced spatial methods, we can improve the accuracy of aquifer mapping, facilitate better resource allocation, and support effective planning for water use in semi-arid environments.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract can be improved by adding a few sentences about the results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I think the manuscript is scientifically sound and can be useful and effective for the scientific community, but it needs revision.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references used in the manuscript are appropriate and sufficient, but they are outdated. It is better to use recent sources (after 2020).	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, it is suitable.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Please pay attention to the comments on the manuscript.	

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:	Nader Jandaghi
Department, University & Country	Gonbad Kavous University, Iran