

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JGEESI_116378</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ASSESSMENT OF SEEPAGE IN AN EMBANKMENT DAM USING VERY LOW FREQUENCY ELECTROMAGNETIC AND GEOELECTRICAL METHODS: A CASE STUDY OF ASEJIRE DAM, IBADAN, SOUTHWESTERN NIGERIA.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Paper</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> )

### **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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes It is very important for scientific community because it is problem based research work.</b></p> <p>2. <b>No, It is not suitable, because Almost same titled research paper have been already published. For new alternative title I don't have any idea.</b></p> <p>3. <b>Abstract of this paper is very large, it should be more Precise and more focused on final work.</b></p> <p>4. <b>No, The Subsection and structure of the manuscript is not appropriate, It should be another style of section and subsection, like number system.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes I Think It is Scientifically correct.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Yes, But Citation of Reference is not proper located.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>No, I feel that the language can be better and also the scientific unit is not written properly and it needs improvement.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. Position of the given figure is not well and their citation is not correct.</p> <p>2. Somewhere the font size of the paragraph is not similar.</p> <p>3. Methodology and Result &amp; Discussion, it should be more effective use some new subtitles.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<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>
<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>Gokul Ram Nishad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dhurwarao Madiya Govt. College, Shaheed Mahendra karma University, India</b>