



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_31538
Title of the Manuscript:	GEOPHYSICAL AND GEOTECHNICAL EVALUATION OF AN EROSION SITE IN EBEM-OHAFIA AREA OF ABIA STATE, SOUTHERN NIGERIA.
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>In the abstract, we need to know the meaning of the results presented before the conclusion. Also include the overall recommendation in the abstract.</p> <p>The map in Figure 2 is too glossy and generally poor visualization. This should be redrawn.</p> <p>The conclusion section lacks “conclusion”. The conclusion should be drawn from the study.</p>	OK
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Is there any difference between geomorphic process and geologic process? Notice that you began the introduction with geomorphic process, but ended it with geologic process. These should be clearly differentiated and let us know which one you are looking at.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The tenses are not consistent.	