

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_122588
Title of the Manuscript:	Spatial evaluation of flood risk using Geospatial and Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA): A case study in Obio-Akpor, Rivers State, 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 paper is original, assessing flood risk in Obio-Akpor area of Nigeria. However, the author(s) need to articulate their findings in a more coherent manner that is easy to understand in the scientific community. At the moment, this paper looks like a rough draft that needs to be improved.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable	
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 needs to be re-written and my comments incorporated (see the attached manuscript file for my comments). Data sources need not to be captured as methodology in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The sub-sections are appropriate except the methodology section, where the author(s) captured analytical methods and tools as their methodological approach. That is wrong. Also, the discussion heading appeared twice in this manuscript. Please, see the attached manuscript file for my detailed comments.	
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>Introduction: Where MCDA is mentioned, I expect that the author cites relevant studies that employed such methods, such as Ihinegbu and Ogunwumi (2022) and Ogunwumi et al (2021). I have attached the link in the attached file. I recommend that he authors briefly describe the structure of this paper in the concluding part of the introduction</p> <p>Materials and Methods It is not necessary to describe the hardware and software used. That is so redundant. The author(s) needs to clearly differentiate between their methodology and data analytical methods. For example, "GIS analysis, reclassification, weighted overlay method, flood risk ranking etc" were captured as methodology. This is wrong because GIS is just a tool for data analysis as well as others listed above. In this study, the broader methodology is MCE and AHP. I expect the author to deliberate on these methods, stating their strengths and weaknesses. Please, see the attached manuscript file for my detailed comments. Authors used MCDA in the introduction and MCE in the methods section. This should be harmonised.</p> <p>Results Maps are not legible enough The author described their methods here which is not appropriate. No uniformity of font types and sizes</p> <p>Conclusion What is the take-home message for the audience of this journal?</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	<p>These references should be incorporated in the methodology where MCE is mentioned:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ihinegbu and Ogunwumi 2022 - https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40808-021-01197-2 2. Ogunwumi et al 2021 - https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=E7pfTB8AAAAJ&citation_for_view=E7pfTB8AAAAJ:d1gkVwhDpl0C 	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I have detailed my comments above as well as in the attached word file. Kindly revise this article using those comments. Also, this article needs English editing services.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Christopher Ihinegbu
Department, University & Country	University of California Irvine, United States