



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JGEESI_47802 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | MAGNETIC SUSCEPTIBILITY MAPPING OF ROCKS AND DEPTH ESTIMATION OF ANOMALIES: A CASE STUDY OF IGARRA AND ITS ENVIRONS. |
| Type of the 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 work deals with the use of magnetic anomalies to map sources through the generation of products of the traformações of the magnetic data and the interpretation of these maps in addition to obtaining solutions of depths for these sources.</p> <p>The work is well written and the language is clear. The methodology was described objectively. But the presentation of some results are confusing. Figure 2 does not appear and it is not possible to interpret its result and follow the reasoning in the text.</p> <p>Table 1 is unconfigured, needs better organization.</p> <p>Figure 4 also does not appear and it is not possible to interpret its result and follow the text.</p> <p>Few grammatical corrections are required.</p> <p>The information in Figure 6 is a repetition of the information of Figure 5, I will pick up one of the two because in terms of the message it becomes repetitive.</p> <p>It would be good in the methodology to insert an illustrative figure showing the main differences between the three methods used to obtain the depths of the sources, since not all the readers know them.</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General comments | | |



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | <i>Alanna Costa Dutra</i> |
| Department, University & Country | <i>Federal University of Bahia, Brazil</i> |