



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_41113
Title of the Manuscript:	GEOSPATIAL PROFILING FOR THRESHOLD MAPPING OF HYDROTHERMAL ALTERATION WITHIN KUSHAKA SCHIST BELT, NORTH CENTRAL NIGERIA: IMPLICATIONS FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION
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:

(<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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>- 42 The second sentence of the introduction (in simplifying ... mineral deposits) need bibliographical reference</p> <p>- Line 60-62 coordinate of the study area, latitude N or S, longitude E or W 69 Birrimian is not 250Ma but 2500-2400 Ma (with reference) 74 – 81: As the migmatite gneiss is dated, so should be older metasediments, younger metasediment and older granite. (with references)</p> <p>83 – 89: the lithologic composition tonalite, granodiorite, syenite and charnockite referred to archean-panafrican domain and can not intrude migmatite gneiss (250 Ma). Arrange the ages with appropriate references</p> <p>94: Fig 1: name of the author cited (after? et al., 1987) 109 : fig 2: the key and coordinate are illegible 141: fig 4: figures and key are illegible, the scale is duplicated and superimpose. 169: table 1: are these data methods or part of result? I think they are part of result and should not enter the methodology. The author should add the standard deviation in this table. 173: fig 5: the key, the scale and coordinate are illegible 186: table 2: mixing of methods and results. I think the last column is results. 194-195: therefore ... mineral deposit" This sentence need reference(s) 210-221: this is not a discussion for this paper. To discuss a result means to compare and interact with other works in the same research domain, with the same methods or not. This paragraph do not have any reference. Is it the first paper dealing with the method? Is it the first paper dealing with zoned alteration?, with hydrothermal alteration? References suggested: Cravero et al., 2001 and 2010; Marfil et al., 2005; Njoya et al., 2006</p>	<p>42- The statement sited appropriately (Sabins, 1999) -Line 60-62 coordinate of the study area corrected(latitudes 10° 33' 32.7"N to 10° 39' 50"N and longitudes 6° 38' 38"E to 6° 43' 40"E) 69-Birimian orogeny is dated 2500Ma not 250Ma as seen in the manuscript. There was an erroneous omission of one zero from the figure. (Burke and Dewey, 1972). 74 – 81 The older metasediments have ages between 1100-900Ma while the younger metasediments ranged in age between 850-700Ma. The older granites on the older granites are dated 750-450Ma(Burke and Dewey, 1972; Turner, 1983) 83 – 89: As stated above, the age of the migmatite gneiss is not 250Ma as erroneous ascerted but 2500Ma therefore intruded the tonalite, granodiorite, syenite and charnockite who are younger in age (Burke and Dewey, 1972; Turner, 1983). In other reports, the migmatite gneiss has ages ranging from Pan African to Eburnean 600Ma-2000Ma (Rahaman 1988)</p> <p>94: Fig 1: (after Woakes et.al. 1987) 109 : Fig 2: the key and coordinate are made clearer 141: Fig 4 corrections made 169- Corrected as proposed 173: Fig 5 the key, scale and coordinate are made clearer and readable 194-195: therefore ... mineral deposit" Referenced (Sinclair, 1974)</p> <p>210-221 The paper rediscussed as suggested. Please let me state here that to the best of my knowledge this is the first paper applying this method (geospatial profiling for threshold mapping of hydrothermal alterations)</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Too much spelling problems 68: migmatite instead of "migmatitie" 69: the last word "under" instead of "into" 194: "associated" instead of "associatted" 200: "derived" instead of "derieved" 216: "spatial" instead of "spartial" 224: "especially" instead of "espercially"</p>	<p>A general checks on spellings done</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The authors should reorganise the paper, making a clear difference between method and results They should discuss their results using appropriate references.</p>	<p>The paper reorganised as suggested</p>