



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_42078
Title of the Manuscript:	SIGNIFANCES OF DEEP SEATED LINEAMENT IN GROUNDWATER STUDIES AROUND ILESHA, SOUTHWESTERN 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>)



SDI 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	See Manuscript	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of procedures (methods) needs minor clarification (clearly remediable) Figures and table (easily remediable) Subject matter is original and important 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The summary is rather long and has to contain the necessary information in particular: The problem, aims, methods, data used, main results and small conclusion Subject matter is original and important The manuscript raises an important subject but the results are not rather important and not discussed well to put it in evidence. The methodology must be rewritten and developed well The results are very summary and must absolutely developed. Figures are bad qualities in general The results were not discussed. Indeed, we do not see the part of the discussion in the section results and discussion. No reference was given. In the results, there are parts of methodology Many mistakes in the document A lineament map is not a hydrogeological map. I suggest that the drillings available are coupled in both maps to highlight the hydrogeological character of the area. According to the author, the lineaments from aeromagnetic are better hydrogeological indicators than lineament from Landsat but this opinion was not well developed The lineaments map was not validated. Authors quickly pass of lineament to fractures what is not still obvious In the lineaments analysis the author does not give the number and the size of mapped lineaments The rose diagram is mute because the frequencies of fractures direction are not indicated. A direction is called dominant (majority) if its frequency exceeds 10%. We note enough repetitions in the manuscript The conclusion is rather long and contain the methodology, it must be reduced and to present only the main results. My Opinion: this article asks a major revision before its publication in the journal 	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Théophile Lasm</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Earth Sciences, University Felix Houphouët-Boigny, Cote d'Ivoire</i>