

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	Original Research 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please corrects the manuscript and highlights 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.	Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. I like this manuscript due to so many reasons, knowing the flood risk sensitive area helps to take action before the loss of most valuable human life as well as our property.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It is clear, concise, and informative. It accurately reflects the content of the paper.	
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.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a good overview of the research question, methodology, results, and implications of the study. The abstract is also well-written and easy to read.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized and easy to follow. The subsections are logical and informative.	
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.	Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology is sound, and the results are presented in a clear and concise manner. However, The authors need to discuss the limitations of their study and suggest directions for future research.	
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 and recent. The authors cite a variety of relevant sources, including recent papers on Spatial evaluation of flood risk using Geospatial and Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA).	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>A good job, This manuscript has scientific relevance and mainly as a data generator for public management of study area. However, the following comments should be improved :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - on data acquisition, the author download sentinel 2 images, but it doesn't know how he/she classify the image. Which software used for image classification and accuracy assessment (ArcGIS, Erdas Imagine, QGIS.....). - On data acquisition, it is important to inform the spatial resolution as well as the datum and projection used. - Description of input parameters are poor, should describe more. - On Figure 1a: the title is too short and lacks description - Figure 4 title, better to say "Flood sensitive/ prone area's in study region(write name of study area) - Better to add Methodological frame work. - Needs detail discussion on the process occurring very high and high risk areas. What are the causes for this risk? - Conclusions should be better presented and showing a summary of the result. - What site specific flood risk control measures does the author recommend to minimize the risk? - Generally, I propose a comparison more with other local and regional work to better value the work. My recommendation for acceptance of the manuscript with minor revision. 	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Samuel Erimyas Teshome</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Debank University, Ethiopia</p>