



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	<p>The manuscript approaches the actual environmental scenario of the MBAA river, taking into account remobilization or resuspension of the sediment via dredging or mining activities on the increase heavy metal concentrations in the stream water either as dissolved elements or as a constituent of suspended particles, in which these elements and particles are injurious to human health when consumed through drinking water, for instance, causing strong environmental impacts, many local diseases, epidemics and deaths to surrounding population.</p> <p>The document presents much valuable and checked information on environmental, geological and mineralogical characteristics of the sources researched, comprising chemical, image, statistic data to support the discussion and conclusions stated along the text.</p> <p>However, some review is needed with regards rewriting the abstract, in order to give more organization to the ideas exposed. Furthermore, Figures must have their sharpnesses improved with some image treatment, because sometimes reading their indications is a tough task. Finally, a peer review in English writing is fundamental to become the text more comprehensible in some parts.</p> <p>Based on the arguments exposed and considering the potential of the approach made by the authors with respect the data obtained along the research, I am for the approval of the manuscript to be published, since the recommendations related to formatting and editing aspects be accomplished.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract was rewritten as recommended by the reviewer. 2. The fonts of letters on the figures increased from 12 to 14. 3. The sharpness of figures increased 4. Some grammatical errors corrected. 5. Special thanks to this reviewer for his very objective comments.
Minor REVISION comments	None	
Optional/General comments	None	



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>	