

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JGEESI_117808
Title of the Manuscript:	Applying the Parameters of Impacted Population and Gully Social Impact Factor to Prioritize Choice of Gully Erosion Intervention Program in Resource-Limited Settings: Lessons from World Bank-Funded Intervention in Anambra 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.journaljgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Questionable.</p> <p>None of the provided references appear to be from peer-reviewed journals. Instead, they consist of articles from various news outlets, reports, dissertations, and online publications. It is highly recommended to add reference from original articles from peer reviewed journals.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>1. The package includes, among others, mapping, enumeration, mobilization, training/capacity building and micro credit grant for alternative livelihood support to selected impacted population. Giving details of these packages would significantly improve the value of this article.</p> <p>2. The direct socio-economic rehabilitation of the impacted population is of great importance, but from a scientific community point of view can it be considered as an innovation? The article only provide data of Average Amount Disbursed to Each Beneficiary. No innovative techniques for rehabilitating gully impacted population are discussed.</p> <p>3. Apart from tables showing details of gullies, population impacted per Km distance and Average Amount Disbursed to Each Beneficiary, not much content analysis, comparative analysis, rational framework and deductive models can be seen in the article which makes it hard to justify the methods mentioned in the abstract.</p> <p>4. It is desirable to properly define and explain the "Gully Social Impact Factor" which is the main focus of the article.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Adarsha Gopalakrishna Bhat
Department, University & Country	Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, India