

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_122308
Title of the Manuscript:	GEOELECTRICAL EVALUATION OF CONTAMINATION IN AND AROUND ORI-ILE BATTERY WASTES DUMPSITE IN IBADAN, SOUTHWESTERN 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>
<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>Strengths: The manuscript is well-structured, with a clear narrative and logical flow. The research addresses a significant gap in the field, and the findings are supported by robust data and analysis. Areas for Improvement: The paper could be strengthened by providing additional references in the literature review and including visual aids in the methodology section.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title is clear and accurately reflects the content of the paper. It succinctly captures the main focus of the research.</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>The abstract clearly outlines the research question, methodology, and key findings. However, it could be more concise by summarizing the conclusions in fewer words.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction provides a comprehensive overview of the research topic and its relevance. The problem statement is clearly articulated, effectively setting the stage for the research. 2. The research question is well-defined and aligns with the stated objectives of the study. 3. The literature review covers a broad range of studies relevant to the research question. It critically evaluates previous work and identifies gaps that the current study aims to fill. 4. The sources are up-to-date and relevant. The review could benefit from additional references to bolster the arguments presented. 5. The methodology is appropriate for the research question and is described in sufficient detail to allow replication. Including a flowchart or diagram could enhance clarity. 6. The results are presented clearly and logically, with appropriate use of tables and figures. Each result is linked to the research question, providing a coherent narrative. 7. The paper acknowledges its limitations and suggests areas for future research, demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the research context. 8. The conclusion succinctly summarizes the main findings and their implications. It reinforces the potential impact of the research. 9. Clear recommendations for future research are provided, highlighting the study's contribution to the field. 	
<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>The description of the procedures and materials is thorough, ensuring reproducibility. The statistical analysis is well-executed and supports the findings. The discussion effectively interprets the results in the context of the existing literature. The implications of the findings are well-articulated.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are formatted correctly and are relevant to the study. Ensure consistency in the citation style throughout the paper.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The paper is well-written, with a clear and logical flow. Minor grammatical errors should be corrected to enhance readability. The writing style is appropriate for an academic audience, maintaining a formal tone throughout.	
Optional/General comments	Based on this review, I would recommend the paper for publication with minor revisions. Addressing the noted areas for improvement would further enhance the manuscript and its contribution to the field.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chuthamat Chiamsathit
Department, University & Country	Kalasin University, Thailand