

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</a>
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 **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:

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

## 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>Figure 2a. Indicate in Map legend that these values are altitudes related to sea level. This should be clear in the legend, as discussed in the sections that follow.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Same two comments above apply for figures 3a and 3b.</p> <p>Figure 5a – units “population/km<sup>2</sup>” should be indicated in the legend or title.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Figure 7 – should the legends say “High elevation” and “Low elevation”??</p> <p>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<sup>2</sup> and comment on those terms.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Analyze the above comment as it also creeps in into the abstract.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Omit name of article in the first sentence of the Abstract.</p> <p>The word “Landforms” in Abstract does not need to begin with uppercase.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Evaluate if both figures 2a and 3a are necessary. Fig . 2a seems similar and more comprehensive (includes contours).</p> <p>Well written and useful for land-planning/management policy.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

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