Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_85294
Title of the Manuscript:	A Geomorphological Survey and Landscape Analysis of Anambra State Southeast Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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:

(https://www.journaljgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

Figure 2a. Indicate in Map tegend that these values are altitudes related to sea level. This should be clear in the legend, and discussed in the sections that follow. In the legend the abbreviation DEM should be expandedioxplained (flow or in the text.). Digital Elevation Model?? This also applies for the title of the figure (below the Map). Same two comments above apply for figures 3a and 3b. Figure 5 – only one legend seems necessary. "Population", as the rest of the graphs are hardly shown at the letmost ide. This is a poleuem of scales in the graph, perhaps best to use various graphs, or use two scales in each. Figure 7 – should the legends as "High leavestor" and "Low devation"?? In the second paragraph of Conclusions, perhaps population density expressed in % is not clearly explained and continues the resider. Fechaps it is best to use usual units, personation" and comment on those terms. There is room to expand on the conclusions as the article is well written and illustrates the geomorphology of the region in a comprehensive way. This section is quite allor, in comparison with the rest of the article. The last paragraph of the conclusions is not supported by the results or data, as the article does not concern listed with technological or scientific issues, but geographical/geomorphological data. Penhaps to relate sclene and technology as related to geographical/geomorphological information use for land planning/management, or clarity really what is management, or clarity really what is management.		Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and
Figure 2a. Indicate in Map legend that these values are altitudes related to sae level. This should be clear in the legend, as discussed in the sections that follow. In the legend the abbreviation DEM should be expanded/explained (there or in the text). (Digital Elevation Model?? This also applies for the title of the figure (below the Map). Same two comments above apply for figures 3a and 3b. Figure 5a — units "population/km" should be indicated in the legend or title. Figure 5a— only melagend seems recessary "Population" as the rest of the graphs are hardly shown at the intrinset side. This is a problem of scales in the graph, perhaps best to use various graphs, or use two scales in each. Figure 7— should the legends say "High elevation" and "Low elevation"?? In the second paragraph of Conclusions, perhaps population density expressed in % is not iclearly explained and confuses the reader. Perhaps it is best to use usual units, persons/km" and comment on those terms. There is room to expand on the conclusions as the article is well written and illustrates the geomorphology of the region in a comprehensive way. This section is quite allow, in comparison with the rest of the article. The last paragraph of the conclusions is not supported by the results or data, as the article does not concern itself with behnological or scientific issues, but geograph Langemorphological data. Perhaps it is on slate science and technology as planning/management, or clarify really what is meant. Analyze the above comment as it also creeps in into the abstract. The word "Landforms" in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase. Optional/General comments Evaluate if both figures 2a and 3a are necessary. Fig. 2a seems similar and more comprehensive (includes contours).			highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write
This should be clear in the legend, as discussed in the sections that follow. In the legend the abbreviation DEM should be expanded/explained (there or in the text). (Digital Elevation Model?? This also applies for the title of the figure (below the Map). Same two comments above apply for figures 3a and 3b. Figure 5a – units "population/km²" should be indicated in the legend or title. Figure 6 - only one legend seems necessary "Population", as the rest of the graphs are hardly shown at the leftmost side. This is a problem of scales in the graph, perhaps best to use various graphs, or use two scales in each. Figure 7 – should the legends say "High elevation" and "Low elevation"?? In the second paragraph of Conclusions, perhaps population density expressed in % is not clearly explained and confuses the reader. Perhaps it is best to use usual units, persons/km² and comment on those terms. There is room to expand on the conclusions as the article is well written and illustrates the geomorphology of the region in a comprehensive way. This section is quite short, in comparison with the rest of the article. The lest paragraph of the conclusions is not supported by the results or data, as the article does not concern itself with therefore placed sort experts itsus, but geographical/geomorphological data. Perhaps to relate sclence and technology as related to geographical/geomorphological and information use for land planning/management, or clarify really what is meant. Analyze the above comment as it also creeps in into the abstract. The word "Landforms" in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase.	Compulsory REVISION comments		
text). (Digital Elevation Model?? This also applies for the title of the figure (below the Map). Same two comments above apply for figures 3a and 3b. Figure 5a – units "population/km²" should be indicated in the legend or title. Figure 5 – only one legend seems necessary "Population", as the rest of the graphs are hardly shown at the lettmost side. This is a problem of scales in the graph, porhaps best to use various graphs, or use two scales in each. Figure 7 – should the tegends say "High elevation" and "Low elevation"?? In the second paragraph of Conclusions, perhaps population density expressed in % is not clearly explained and confuses the reader. Perhaps it is best to use usual units, persons/km² and comment on those terms. There is room to expand on the conclusions as the article is well written and illustrates the geomorphology of the region in a comprehensive way. This section is quite short, in comparison with the rest of the article. The last paragraph of the conclusions is not supported by the results or data, as the article does not concern useful with the rest of the article. The last paragraph of the conclusions is not supported by the results or data, as the article does not concern useful with the rest of the article. The last paragraph of the conclusions is not supported by the results or data, as the article does not concern useful with the rest of the article. The last paragraph of the conclusions is not supported by the results or data, as the article does not concern useful with the rest of the article. The word "Landforms" in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase. Gottonal/General comments Evaluate it both figures 2a and 3a are necessary. Fig. 2a seems similar and more comprehensive (includes contours).			
Figure 5 a - units "population/km" should be indicated in the legend or title. Figure 6 - only one legend seems necessary "Population", as the rest of the graphs are hardly shown at the letrinost side. This is a problem of scales in the graph, perhaps best to use various graphs, or use two scales in each. Figure 7 - should the legends say "High elevation" and "Low elevation"?? In the second paragraph of Conclusions, perhaps population density expressed in %, is not clearly explained and confuses the reader. Perhaps it is best to use usual units, persons/km" and comment on those terms. There is room to expand on the conclusions as the article is well written and illustrates the geomorphology of the region in a comprehensive way. This section is quite short, in comparison with the rest of the article. The last paragraph of the conclusions is not supported by the results or data, as the article does not concern itself with technological or scientific issues, but geographical/geomorphological data. Perhaps to redscende and technology as related to geographical/geomorphological ain a. Perhaps to redscende and technology as related to geographical/geomorphological information use for land planning/management, or clarify relative what is mean. Analyze the above comment as it also creeps in into the abstract. Minor REVISION comments Omit name of article in the first sentence of the Abstract. The word "Landforms" in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase.		text). (Digital Elevation Model?? This also applies for the title of the figure (below	
Figure 6 - only one legend seems necessary "Population", as the rest of the graphs are hardly shown at the leftmost side. This is a problem of scales in the graph, perhaps best to use various graphs, or use two scales in each. Figure 7 - should the legends say "High elevation" and "Low elevation"?? In the second paragraph of Conclusions, perhaps population density expressed in % is not clearly explained and confuses the reader. Perhaps it is best to use usual units, persons/m" and comment on those terms. There is room to expand on the conclusions as the article is well written and illustrates the geomerphology of the region in a comprehensive way. This section is quite short, in comparison with the rest of the article. The last paragraph of the conclusions is not supported by the results or data, as the article does not concern itself with technological or scientific issues, but geographical/geomorphological information use for land planning/management, or clarify really what is meant. Analyze the above comment as it also creeps in into the abstract. Minor REVISION comments Minor REVISION comments Dittional/General comments Evaluate if both figures 2a and 3a are necessary. Fig. 2a seems similar and more comprehensive (includes contours).		Same two comments above apply for figures 3a and 3b.	
are hardly shown at the leftmost side. This is a problem of scales in the graph, perhaps best to use various graphs, or use two scales in each. Figure 7 – should the legends say "High elevation" and "Low elevation"?? In the second paragraph of Conclusions, perhaps population density expressed in % is not clearly explained and confuses the reader. Perhaps lis best to use usual units, persons/km" and comment on those terms. There is room to expand on the conclusions as the article is well written and illustrates the geomorphology of the region in a comprehensive way. This section is quite short, in comparison with the rest of the article. The last paragraph of the conclusions is not supported by the results or data, as the article does not concern itself with technological or scientific issues, but geographical/geomorphological data. Perhaps to relate science and technology as related to geographical/geomorphological data. Perhaps to relate science and technology as related to geographical/geomorphological mannagement, or clarify really what is meant. Analyze the above comment as it also creeps in into the abstract. Minor REVISION comments Omit name of article in the first sentence of the Abstract. The word "Landforms" in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase. Optional/General comments Evaluate if both figures 2a and 3a are necessary. Fig. 2a seems similar and more comprehensive (includes contours).		Figure 5a – units "population/km2" should be indicated in the legend or title.	
In the second paragraph of Conclusions, perhaps population density expressed in % is not clearly explained and confuses the reader. Perhaps it is best to use usual units, persons/fm² and comment on those terms. There is room to expand on the conclusions as the article is well written and illustrates the geomorphology of the region in a comprehensive way. This section is quite short, in comparison with the rest of the article. The last paragraph of the conclusions is not supported by the results or data, as the article does not concern itself with technological or scientific issues, but geographical/geomorphological data. Perhaps to relate science and technology as related to geographical/geomorphological information use for land planning/management, or clarify really what is meant. Analyze the above comment as it also creeps in into the abstract. The word "Landforms" in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase. Omit name of article in the first sentence of the Abstract. The word "Landforms" in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase.		are hardly shown at the leftmost side. This is a problem of scales in the graph,	
is not clearly explained and confuses the reader. Perhaps it is best to use usual units, persons/km² and comment on those terms. There is room to expand on the conclusions as the article is well written and illustrates the geomorphology of the region in a comprehensive way. This section is quite short, in comparison with the rest of the article. The last paragraph of the conclusions is not supported by the results or data, as the article does not concern itself with technological or scientific issues, but geographical/geomorphological data. Perhaps to relate science and technology as related to geographical/geomorphological information use for land planning/management, or clarify really what is meant. Analyze the above comment as it also creeps in into the abstract. Minor REVISION comments Omit name of article in the first sentence of the Abstract. The word "Landforms" in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase. Optional/General comments Evaluate if both figures 2a and 3a are necessary. Fig. 2a seems similar and more comprehensive (includes contours).		Figure 7 – should the legends say "High elevation" and "Low elevation"??	
illustrates the geomorphology of the region in a comprehensive way. This section is quite short, in comparison with the rest of the article. The last paragraph of the conclusions is not supported by the results or data, as the article does not concern itself with technological or scientific issues, but geographical/geomorphological data. Perhaps to relate science and technology as related to geographical/geomphological information use for land planning/management, or clarify really what is meant. Analyze the above comment as it also creeps in into the abstract. Minor REVISION comments Omit name of article in the first sentence of the Abstract. The word "Landforms" in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase. Optional/General comments Evaluate if both figures 2a and 3a are necessary. Fig. 2a seems similar and more comprehensive (Includes contours).		is not clearly explained and confuses the reader. Perhaps it is best to use usual	
article does not concern itself with technological or scientific issues, but geographical/geomorphological data. Perhaps to relate science and technology as related to geographical/geomorphological information use for land planning/management, or clarify really what is meant. Analyze the above comment as it also creeps in into the abstract. Minor REVISION comments Omit name of article in the first sentence of the Abstract. The word "Landforms" in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase. Optional/General comments Evaluate if both figures 2a and 3a are necessary. Fig. 2a seems similar and more comprehensive (includes contours).		illustrates the geomorphology of the region in a comprehensive way. This section	
Minor REVISION comments Omit name of article in the first sentence of the Abstract. The word "Landforms" in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase. Optional/General comments Evaluate if both figures 2a and 3a are necessary. Fig . 2a seems similar and more comprehensive (includes contours).		article does not concern itself with technological or scientific issues, but geographical/geomorphological data. Perhaps to relate science and technology as related to geographical/geomorphological information use for land	
Omit name of article in the first sentence of the Abstract. The word "Landforms" in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase. Optional/General comments Evaluate if both figures 2a and 3a are necessary. Fig . 2a seems similar and more comprehensive (includes contours).		Analyze the above comment as it also creeps in into the abstract.	
The word "Landforms" in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase. Optional/General comments Evaluate if both figures 2a and 3a are necessary. Fig . 2a seems similar and more comprehensive (includes contours).	Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments Evaluate if both figures 2a and 3a are necessary. Fig . 2a seems similar and more comprehensive (includes contours).		Omit name of article in the first sentence of the Abstract.	
Evaluate if both figures 2a and 3a are necessary. Fig . 2a seems similar and more comprehensive (includes contours).		The word "Landforms" in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase.	
comprehensive (includes contours).	Optional/General comments		
Well written and useful for land-planning/management policy.			
		Well written and useful for land-planning/management policy.	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

		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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ricardo Morales Vargas
Department, University & Country	School for Health Technologies, University of Costa Rica (Central Campus), Costa Rica

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)