

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_122640
Title of the Manuscript:	Modelling and Assessment of Flood Vulnerability of Settlements in Owerri West L.G.A in Imo State, Nigeria Using Remote Sensing and GIS
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 '**Jack 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</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. In this study, the author(s) have attempted to demarcate the study area into different levels of flood vulnerability potential zones using remote sensing and Geographic Information System (GIS). They have used software like ArcGIS 10.3, ERDAS Imagine and supher11. Also, they used some data, including ASTER DEM of 30 m resolution, LANDSAT imagery of resolution 30m, administrative map of the study area, GPS point locations of communities within the study area and population statistics of the study area.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Y e s</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Y e s</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Y e s</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>(i) Contribution to existing knowledge : Medium,</p> <p>(ii) Organization and readability : Good,</p> <p>(iii) Soundness of methodology : Up to the mark,</p> <p>(iv) Evidence supports conclusion : Sufficiently good.</p> <p>(v) Adequacy of literature review : Medium.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, the references is recent but not sufficient. Also the references are not arranged in conventional sequence.</p>	

Review Form 3

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Nil	

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:	Sanjib Kumar Datta
Department, University & Country	University of Kalyani, India