

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOGER_87281
Title of the Manuscript:	Geospatial Interpolation of Gold Anomalies: Kriging Verse Inverse Distance Weight
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://journalajoger.com/index.php/AJOGER/editorial-policy>

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Your manuscript is interesting worthy of investigation but I think the following areas can be improved.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The topic is too broad. Your interpretation is solely based on the 2D and 3D maps produced in your studies. There is no comparism of your results with similar works done in the study area or elsewhere. There is no follow-up data collection at area between sampling points to verify the prediction of the maps (models) that would allow for informed interpretation. Your interpretation and conclusion are therefore very speculative. The map of the study area is poorly presented There are some grammatical errors that must be corrected. <p>To improve the quality of the manuscript, I suggest the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Add the study area to the topic to make it specific (eg; Geospatial Interpolation of Gold Anomalies in the Wassa-Amenfi District of Ghana: Kriging Verse Inverse Distance Weight) Take few samples within the areas predicted by the kriging and IDW methods and plot them on the produced map to verify the accuracy of their predictions. Read and compare your findings with similar works done within the study area and/or elsewhere. Explain why one method is better than the other using the results of your study as well as the different mathematical equations behind the two methods. Clearly show your study area (and if possible the sample points) on the map. 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Victor Ofori Agyemang
Department, University & Country	Community Water and Sanitation Agency, Ghana