

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_113099
Title of the Manuscript:	Synergizing Geotechnical and Geophysical Analysis for Artificial Recharge Well and Aquifer Studies – A Comprehensive Review
Type of the Article	Review Article

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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes The manuscript provides the basic methodological background related to groundwater recharge wells using geotechnical and geophysical methods.</p> <p>2. No The tittle should be modify from “Synergizing Geotechnical and Geophysical Analysis for Artificial Recharge Well and Aquifer Studies – A Comprehensive Review” to “Synergizing Geophysical Analysis and Geotechnical for Artificial Recharge Well and Aquifer Studies – A Comprehensive Review” The reason is because the geophysical method comes from in the writeup.</p> <p>3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The statement “quality and quantity of groundwater resources” should be properly consider because the review is more on aquifer rather than groundwater resources (The qualitative and quantitative aspect of groundwater is a complex topic on it own). The abstract should re-work on. <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The geophysical method is not review in detailed. With failure review research in which this method has been sucefully used. The methodological illustration can be improved and the figures illustration was not cited in the writeup. <p>7. The references are not sufficient and recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language quality is suitable but can improved.</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:	Oluwadamilare Oluwadamilare Odugbesan
Department, University & Country	University of Haifa, Israel