

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Geological Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJGER_127364 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | AQUIFER VULNERABILTY ASSESSEMENT AROUND A MAJOR DUMPSITE LOCATED WITHIN GOSHEN CITY IN NASARAWA STATE USING INTEGRATED GEOPHYSICAL METHODS |
| 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|---|---|
| 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 manuscript is good enough for publication due to the importance of the subject in the Northern part of Nigeria. It is informative and educative in geological, geography and environmental feed of research. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | A deep arrangement needs to be done to make it more standard to manuscript acceptance level. See my comments attached to the manuscript itself. | |
| 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 is comprehensive but too wordy. It needs to be worked on to 250 to 300 words if that's accepted by the journal. It also needs to be corrected grammatically and well structured. There were many repetition which are not acceptable in terms of standard. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | The subsection needs to be worked on too to have an appropriate arrangement standard especially from the introduction, methodology and discussion area. See comments in the manuscript | |
| 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. | Scientifically the manuscript is acceptable, but the grammar and arrangements needs to be worked on. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | Yes, the references are sufficient but minor review needed | |
| Minor REVISION comments | The language is okay but need working and rearranging. | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| Optional/General comments | It's good for publication only after proper arrangement. | |

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: | Godspower Omokaro |
| Department, University & Country | Institute of Ecology, Peoples Friendship University of Russia, Russia |