



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_46208
Title of the Manuscript:	Geospatial Statistical Analysis of the Seismic Points to Evaluate the Geotectonic Hazards along the Mediterranean Coastal Zone of Egypt
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>1.The topic of this article is very fundamental. Theoretical knowledge used in the manuscript has been incomplete. The title does not disclose content of the presented work.</p> <p>2. Abstract should be a brief summary of the Contents and Conclusions of the paper. Please, clearly write the aims of this study and shortly results of the paper.</p> <p>3. Introduction: Research problem definition, brief survey of relevant literature, reasons and objectives for doing the research, intention of the paper and impact of the study. Briefs must be given of key concepts central to the paper. Also, it is recommended described the methods of analyses which used the other scientist. Now, the researchers used the Remote Sensing method. The authors used only 5 citations in the Introduction chapter. It is small quantity.</p> <p>4. Materials and Methods: The data for this research explained well. Already, the methods should be mentioned with references. In the article explain only the programme (ArcMap) data processing module. I recommended input the better explanation of method, may be in the schematic view and involve formulas of calculation.</p> <p>5. Result and Discussion: I recommender the text from line 173-192 move to the study area chapter. The Figure (2) Tectonic sketch map of Mediterranean basin will be in the line 90. This is the materials skill. Results should be clearly described. The structure present of results are difficult understandable.</p> <p>6. Conclusions. Where is the novelty in this work? The figure 9 should be in the result chapter.</p> <p>9. The list of references are sufficient. But in the text should be in the end of sentences. All references should follow the following style. See the guide for author. The style of references should be repaired.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>1. The manuscript should be reconstructed and repaired by the journal GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS and REVISION COMMENTS.</p> <p>2. The style of references should be repaired.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Jūratė Sužiedelytė Visockienė</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Lithuania</i>