



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Geological Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJGER_41113</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>GEOSPATIAL PROFILING FOR THRESHOLD MAPPING OF HYDROTHERMAL ALTERATION WITHIN KUSHAKA SCHIST BELT, NORTH CENTRAL NIGERIA: IMPLICATIONS FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>- <b>42 The second sentence of the introduction</b> (in simplifying ... mineral deposits) need bibliographical reference</p> <p>-</p> <p>Line 60-62 coordinate of the study area, latitude N or S, longitude E or W</p> <p>69 Birrimian is not 250Ma but 2500-2400 Ma (with reference)</p> <p>74 – 81: As the migmatite gneiss is dated, so should be older metasediments, younger metasediment and older granite. (with references)</p> <p><b>83 – 89:</b> 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><b>94: Fig 1:</b> name of the author cited (after .....? et al., 1987)</p> <p><b>109 :</b> fig 2: the key and coordinate are illegible</p> <p><b>141:</b> fig 4: figures and key are illegible, the scale is duplicated and superimpose.</p> <p><b>169:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>173: fig 5:</b> the key, the scale and coordinate are illegible</p> <p>186: table 2: mixing of methods and results. I think the last column is results.</p> <p><b>194-195:</b> therefore ... mineral deposit" This sentence need reference(s)</p> <p><b>210-221:</b> 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?</p> <p>References suggested: Cravero et al., 2001 and 2010; Marfil et al., 2005; Njoya et al., 2006</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Too much spelling problems</p> <p>68: migmatite instead of "migmatitie"</p> <p>69: the last word "under" instead of "into"</p> <p>194: "associated" instead of "associatted"</p> <p>200: "derived" instead of "derieved"</p> <p>216: "spatial" instead of "spartial"</p> <p>224: "especially" instead of "espercially"</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The authors should reorganise the paper, making a clear difference between method and results</p> <p>They should discuss their results using appropriate references.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tassongwa Bernard</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Dschang, Cameroon</b>

