



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_48882
Title of the Manuscript:	SEDIMENTOLOGICAL AND GEOCHEMICAL CHARACTERIZATION OF SURFICIAL SEDIMENT OF A MEANDER SECTION OF MBAA RIVER AT NNEISE–UGIRI COMMUNITY IN IMO STATE OF 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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author(s) need to revise the tittle of the manuscript to connote why this study. 2. The abstract is not informative enough not clearly showing what prompted or what problem or gap this work is seeking to solve/fill. 3. Two samples are TOO INSIGNIFICANT for the write-up. 4. The methods is not detailed enough, NOT clear on the petrographic analysis. 5. The mineralogical composition of the sediments should be inferred from the geochemistry rather than from the petrography as the/they try to do. 6. The author(s) needs to rework on the study area map and get it in geological map form than it is. THIS is not a hydrology/hydrochemistry paper. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We beg to disagree with the reviewer on the title. The title stated clearly what has been done and the location of study. Adding why it was done will make the title to be too long. The reason for the study is clearly stated in the abstract and introduction of the manuscript. 2. The introductory part of the abstract was rewritten to show clearly what prompted this study. 3. The sampling locations were increased to four (4) especially for mineralogy and chemical composition analysis. We believe four sampling locations are significant enough for the meander section that is a small area. Textural characteristics were very similar almost in all the locations, hence we presented one each for channel centre and margin as mean results for the studied locations. 4. The method of study was revised. 5. Geochemistry was used to confirmed minerals identified via petrographic studies. E.g high iron (Fe) concentrations and haematite 6. Geological map is now included. A paragraph was used to elaborate more on the geology of the study area.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>	