



Paper: **“Developing Sustainable Flood Risk Management Framework for Kebbi State, Nigeria”**

Corresponding Author: Ali Bakari

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n23p233

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Bupinder Zutshi
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 31.08.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Prof. Bupinder Zutshi	Email:
University/Country: Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India	
Date Manuscript Received: 25th June 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 30th June 2020
Manuscript Title: Developing Sustainable Flood Risk Management Framework for Kebbi State, Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it adequately represents the content of the article.	4
Yes the title broadly reflects the contents of the research paper.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>Yes the abstract represents the objectives, research methodology and broad results of the paper. However key words requires changes. It should replace Kebbi State and Nigeria with other words reflecting the focus of the paper.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Language used in the research paper is fine.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Sample design and methodological approach needs further elaboration indicating that it represents the universe adequately. Perhaps a section should explain the design of study and methodology for clarity of the readers.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
The objectives of this study were met. The findings of the research are in sync with the results of the study. The author should give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence. Table No 5 should be replaced with an accurate map depicting the table results.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Researcher has given accurate conclusion as per the results derived from the field survey data.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>References are comprehensive and in sync with the Journal referencing policy</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	Yes
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Author may consider the changes suggested