

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_JGEESI_117808</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>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.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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**

	<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></li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b></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. Yes, the manuscript is essential for the scientific community because: Novel Approach: Introduces new prioritization methods for gully erosion interventions, focusing on socio-economic impacts. Practical Insights: Offers actionable recommendations for policymakers in resource-limited settings. Valuable Case Study: Provides lessons from the NEWMAP intervention in Anambra State, Nigeria. Robust Methodology: Uses an interdisciplinary approach that combines qualitative and quantitative methods. Policy Impact: Data-driven recommendations for improving gully erosion interventions. Empirical Data: Enhances understanding of gully erosion impacts and is helpful for future research. Overall, it contributes significantly to environmental science and policy.</li> <li>2. Yes, the title is suitable. It reflects the study's focus on prioritizing gully erosion interventions using impacted population and gully social impact factor, specifically in resource-limited settings, with lessons from a World Bank-funded project in Anambra State, Nigeria.</li> <li>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. It includes the following: Background: Gully erosion in Nigeria and NEWMAP's intervention. Objective: Learning from NEWMAP in Anambra State. Methodology: Multidisciplinary focus group and analysis methods. Findings: Innovation in rehabilitating impacted populations and economic benefits. Conclusion: Effective parameters for prioritizing interventions. It briefly summarizes the study.</li> <li>4. Yes, the subsections and structure are appropriate: Abstract: Summarizes the study. Introduction: Provides background and objectives. Method: Describes methodology. Result: Presents findings with tables. Discussion: Interprets results and implications. Conclusion: Summarizes critical findings and recommendations. Abbreviations: Lists abbreviations used. References: Cites sources. The structure ensures clarity and logical flow.</li> <li>5. Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The methodology is sound, involving a multidisciplinary focus group and robust analysis techniques. The data is well-presented, and the findings are logically derived from the data. The results support the conclusions, and the recommendations are practical and data-driven. Overall, the study adheres to scientific standards and provides valuable insights into gully erosion intervention strategies.</li> <li>6. The references are sufficient and recent. Suggestions for additional references include: recent studies on erosion and socio-economic impacts, global best practices in erosion management, and technical reports on gully erosion. Examples: FAO (2021) "Soil Erosion: the greatest challenge for sustainable soil management," UNDP (2020) "Managing soil erosion for climate resilience," Jones et al. (2020) "Economic Impacts of Soil Erosion in Developing Countries."</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>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is well-written, clear, and free of significant grammatical errors. It uses appropriate academic language and terminology, making it accessible to the scientific community.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Expand on how the 7-man multidisciplinary focus group was selected and what specific expertise they brought to the study. Describe the process of their discussions and decision-making, including how consensus was reached on identifying the most striking innovations and determining key parameters.</li> <li>2. Add graphs or charts to visually represent the data from Tables 1, 2, and 3. For instance, a bar chart showing the lengths of gully sites and the impacted population could quickly convey the scale of interventions. A line graph could illustrate the distribution of the gully social impact factor across different sites.</li> <li>3. Address potential biases in the study, such as any limitations of the focus group approach or the data sources used. Discuss how these biases might affect the findings and the measures to mitigate them. This will enhance the transparency and reliability of the study.</li> <li>4. Expand the literature review to include recent publications on similar erosion interventions in other parts of the world. Comparing the Anambra State intervention with those in other regions can provide a more comprehensive understanding of gully erosion management's unique and everyday challenges.</li> <li>5. Provide a more detailed analysis of the socio-economic impacts of the intervention. Include case studies or testimonials from beneficiaries to illustrate the qualitative aspects of the effect. Additionally, discuss how the intervention has influenced broader economic indicators in the state, such as employment rates or economic growth.</li> </ol>	
---	--	--

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jonty Mago</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Center for Automotive Research and Tribology, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, India and Purdue University, United States</b>