



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_30117
Title of the Manuscript:	GEOCHEMICAL CHARACTERIZATION AND PROTOLITH OF THE MIGMATITE-GNEISSES OF TANDAMA AREA, KATSINA STATE, NW 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 (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	This paper needs major restructuration according to the geochemical study of metamorphic rocks. The data are relevant but not used in the appropriated way. Note: For geochemical study of metamorphic rocks based on whole rock geochemistry steps are as follow: 1-Used thee data to determine the nature of protoliths i.e Ortho- or Para- derived, according to this, Figure 8 in the manuscript should be the first ! 2-After noticed that (in this case) the metamorphic rocks are orthoderived, use the classification diagrams of magmatic rock to determine protolith's name (Figure 6b in the manuscript should be the second, to this I suggest to add classification diagram of Debon Lefort available in GCDKits) 3-Now knowing that the protoliths are granitoids, use various characterization diagrams of granitoids to characterize the protoliths. in this case no need to use primitive mantle to normalize spider diagrams in figure 7, use chondrite or continental crust Figure 2, 3, 4 is welcome here. But for figure 3 include the field of S-type and I-type granitoid, by doing this authors will notice what they said in the abstract line 5 (and in the text) concerning I-Type will be corrected because protoliths here are I-type and S-type. 4-In paragraph 2.geological area, include the petrography photographs and photomicrographs of the studied rocks So if text and figure are restructured this way the paper will be more relevant because the geochemical data are very good to characterize the protoliths	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1)-The authors must harmonize the rock types and names, from title, trough text and figure, up to geological map. 2)-The geological map must match with the text. Its legend, axis and scales are fruzzy. The scale is not correct; the authors must consider what represent 1' in km. 3)-References need to be cross checked properly, many authors cited in the text don't appear in the references and vis versa. [e.g: Onyeagocha (1984) ; Oyinloye, 1998; 2002; 2004; Sun and McDonough (1995)...etc] 4)-Deleete the entire paragraph 4.1 Chhemical alteration, it is not necessary in this paper 5)-Extend the description of analytical methods used by Acme laboratory 6)-Conclusion doesn't not match with the content of the paper, I suggest to rewrite the conclusion according to the mains finding of this paper 7)- Many diagrams used to say the same thing (e.g: Figure 6, Figure 10 and Figure 11) 8)-Some diagrams are repeated (e.g: Figure 2 and Figure 9; Figure 6 and Figure 11...etc) 9)-Some diagrams are not really appropriated to acid rocks 10)- Label the field in the figure 8(a) 11)-Figure 4 is fuzzy !	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	For figures: -Redraw all the diagrams generated from GCDKits. -Increase the symbols size and the text font size used to label axis, keys and other	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Kouankap Nono Gus Djibril</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Geology, The University Of Bamenda, Cameroon</i>