

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_116378
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF SEEPAGE IN AN EMBANKMENT DAM USING VERY LOW FREQUENCY ELECTROMAGNETIC AND GEOELECTRICAL METHODS: A CASE STUDY OF ASEJIRE DAM, IBADAN, SOUTHWESTERN NIGERIA.
Type of the 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.journalgeesi.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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript focuses on a common problem but uses a program to focus the information on a specific area. I consider it suitable for the scientific community. However, several aspects must be corrected. 2. The title is adequate but it is suggested to make it shorter, allowing the case study to be omitted. 3. The summary is correct, although it is necessary to add what the contribution is to the scientific community, since this is crucial to highlight the relevance and originality of the work compared to other similar investigations. It is suggested that it describes an innovative approach: that is, it highlights how the research addresses this gap or need in an innovative or unique way. Finally, it is suggested to emphasize why this new knowledge is important for the scientific community. 4. The organization of article is not clear mainly due to the lack of subtitles. In the methodology when describing the area of study, it is not convenient to use references, if necessary, add them consider them in the introduction but in the methodology only focus on the methods. 5. The manuscript is scientifically appropriate for publication, as long as the points mentioned are corrected. 6. It is suggested to add references that can strengthen the support and contextualization of the scientific work. A broader search should be conducted in scientific databases relevant to your field, including recent and classic studies that support your claims. <p>Visual presentation of data is crucial to conveying information effectively. The author is suggested to express: Clarity and legibility: care must be taken to ensure that the elements in maps and figures are clear and legible, using contrasting colours and legible fonts for any text. Organization: Maps do not have a logical and coherent organization. Image quality: The images used are not high resolution to guarantee adequate visual quality.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The quality of English is adequate, just avoid excessive use of prepositions</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Luis Jesus Osornio Berthet
Department, University & Country	National Polytechnic Institute, Mexico