

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Geological Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJGER_111510</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of Aquifer Vulnerability and Groundwater Prospects Using Electrical Resistivity Method in parts of Nnewi Southeastern Nigeria.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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>
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submitted manuscript is highly relevant and valuable to the scientific community. It is being reviewed. It makes a major addition to the field of research, and its title is very important because it sums up the main ideas and topics covered in the work.</li> <li>2. The title is also interesting and essential</li> <li>3. The abstract provides readers with an overview of the main ideas and findings and serves as a starting point for them. It gives readers a comprehensive understanding of the topic, enabling them to make informed decisions about whether to read the piece again. The abstract of the article creates a strong foundation by offering readers an engaging, clear, and succinct synopsis.</li> <li>4. The overall structure of the manuscript and its subsections are considered appropriate. But the explanations given for each component don't seem to go far enough, and more information is needed.</li> <li>5. This meticulously researched and expertly reviewed text is credible and factual. Consistent facts and solid scientific principles provide the basis of the information. Every statement and assertion follows the scientific method and is supported by substantial evidence. Researchers and readers looking for current, accurate information can rely on the text as a reliable source.</li> <li>6. The references are recent but need additional references specially in introduction part and result and discussion.</li> </ol>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Moderate English is utilized, however, it needs to be revised so that native speakers can accept it globally. Too long statements have been used throughout the manuscript. It has to be precise short supported by scientific articles.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript in titled" Assessment of Aquifer Vulnerability and Groundwater Prospects Using Electrical Resistivity Method in parts of Nnewi Southeastern Nigeria to <b>Asian Journal of Geological Research</b> has been reviewed.</p> <p>Reviewing the manuscript, the reviewer recommended minor revision is required considering the following given minor comments.</p>	

## Review Form 1.7

	<p>However, reviewing the manuscript, reviewer found minor comments that the author has to carefully correct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Several sections of your submissions lack citations.</li><li>➤ The research gap described in the essay is shallow, notwithstanding its originality.</li><li>➤ Provide an explanation of the problem statement and substantiate it with empirical data.</li><li>➤ Upon reviewing your manuscript, the reviewer discovered that the author made excessively lengthy claims. Consequently, attempt to shorten. The geospatial data used in this work have not clearly stated in methodology part.</li><li>➤ Moreover the data sources, how you can get these data, methods you used to get final result with data has to be clearly specified.</li></ul> <p>The maps are in visible. Increase visibility of maps, typically the map lends.</p>	
--	---	--

### **PART 2:**

	<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 authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>Jerjera Ulu Guduru</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Haramaya University, Haramaya Institute of Technology, Ethiopia</b>