



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_23379
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphometry and Flood in Small Drainage Basin: Case Study of Mayogwoi River Basin in Jalingo, Taraba State Nigeria
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript should be revised. There is nothing new in the article excepting the application to a new scenery that has interest for local or regional authorities and researchers. I think it is not adequate to add at the end of the abstract and behind the conclusion the technical recommendations given. We do not have enough support for this. The references used are very old. I suggest looking for new ones if possible. Talking about references, some of the references cited in the text are not given in the REFERENCES, i.e. line 37 Strahler 1958, line 40 Piyasiri and Nandalal 2004, etc.... many of them along the text. Authors also forget to follow the journal style in the references. Some mistakes as "et al." and the necessity of checking in deep the REFERENCES: eliminate the references not cited in the text, check the correspondence within the text, i.e. Roger (1971)???? and so on. In page 5, authors can add a table indicating the formulae and the references for their calculations to improve the paper. I suggest it is better to write Results rather than Result and findings. Please check the format of the text along the paper, the spaces between punctuation marks and words,...	I agree that the manuscript may need revision here and there but it not every research that will introduce something new. The most important thing is if a research has any relevance in solving a problem somewhere. I have deleted the technical recommendation in the abstract and behind the conclusion. I have gone through the references and address the issues raised This may not be necessary, there is existing acceptable literatures on these. It will make the work unnecessarily lengthier. Results taken. Noted
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		