

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_127468
Title of the Manuscript:	Petrographic characterisation of the Mounio "Younger Granites" province, central portion of the Pan-African mobile chain located to the east of the West African Craton (Gouré, south-east Niger)
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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The study can generally be considered a well-conducted research. The classification of the Younger Granites into three distinct groups is a well-thought-out approach. However, when looking at the overall work, I believe that the discussion section should be elaborated in more detail.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The article is suitable for the title.	
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 of the article is somewhat adequate. The mineralogical content percentages of the Younger Granites, obtained from thin sections, could be presented in the abstract by showing specific minerals.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 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 structure and sections of the manuscript are appropriate. I consider the article to be a good research paper from both a scientific and technical perspective. Overall, I believe more definitive comments should be made in some sections. In other words, the results and discussion sections could be explained in more detail scientifically. For example, what is the contribution of the study to science in the investigated area? Is it sufficient to distinguish between Older Granites and Younger Granites based solely on mineralogical composition?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are sufficient, but the number of recent sources is quite low. I recommend looking into articles such as Mahamane M. S. Chékaraou and Moussa Konaté (2021), Lawali Idi Chamsi et al., 2024.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is good for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	Rock descriptions have been made, but I believe it would be clearer if modal analysis were performed and presented in a table within the text. Additionally, rock naming can be done using the Streickeisen, 1976 (QAP) diagram for plutonic rocks. This could also be validated with thin sections. In the text, the section on Alkaline and Hyperalkaline granites could mention the alkali component content in alkaline granites. For Hyperalkaline granites, a comparison could be made regarding whether their component contents are higher or lower than those of alkaline granites. Furthermore, details about the texture of both granite types could be added to the text.	

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:	Zikullah Samet Guloglu
Department, University & Country	Zonguldak Bulent Ecevit University, Çaycuma Vocational School, Turkey