

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_126603
Title of the Manuscript:	Transient Electromagnetic Method for Mapping Sulphide Rich Zone in Tsauni, Northcentral, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript represents an essential contribution to geophysical exploration by demonstrating how the TEM method could be effectively used to delineate sulphide-rich zones within high-resistive geological settings, as obtained at Tsauni in Northcentral Nigeria. I appreciate the methodical rigors it shows and the applied relevance that produces great insight into mineral mapping under conditions that are challenging.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	This title is also suitable. I have a suggested title "Application of Transient Electromagnetic Method for Mapping Deep-Seated Sulphide-Rich Zones in High-Resistivity Settings: A Case Study in Tsauni, Northcentral Nigeria" may be similar to this will be better,	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is good to give an idea of the research work, but it should contain more detail. It would be worth mentioning here why TEM has an advantage in high-resistivity situations over the galvanic approach. Also, stating the main results clearly and adding one sentence on practical applications in geological environments of this type would make the abstract more complete and interesting for a wide circle of readers.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-organized and subdivided into the following sections: introduction, methodology, description of the site, data processing, results, and interpretation. Most of these sections are logically arranged in such a way that any reader would find it easy to trace the development of the objectives, methods, and results of the study. However, it lacks the Discussion section that would have given further analysis of the findings in comparison to similar studies, hence making emphasis on general implications. This addition would further strengthen the manuscript by putting contributions into context within the area of research that is geophysical exploration.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The scientific robustness of this manuscript, underlined by the clear application of the TEM method in a geologically complex scenario, has proved to be an effective strategy for detecting sulphide-rich zones. The geophysical principles applied are established, and the software used for electromagnetic response modeling, Maxwell, is recognized; therefore, this work strengthens the technical soundness of this methodology. Finally, the detailed description of the survey design and data processing steps allows for reproducibility and transparency in the proposed methodology. Its credibility is further underpinned by how the manuscript aligns with relevant scientific literature, adding worth to the insights on mineral exploration techniques in high-resistivity environments.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the language used is mainly appropriate for scholarly communication since the technical content of the paper is clear, and the formal tone is quite suitable for the scientific paper. Yet, certain sentences require further refinement to make the readability and flow of the article more amenable, especially in sections where explanation of complex technical details is involved. Minor adjustments in sentence structure and terminology may be required to enhance clarity and ensure that the language is indeed per the highest standards expected from scholarly publications.	
Optional/General comments	Almost all the figures including location map, could be improved. Also, instead of taking screenshot of whole interface of Maxwell software, could have been exported the figure and explained the figure in detail using text.	

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:	Pratikshya Regmi
Department, University & Country	North Carolina State University, United States