

Manuscript: “**Geophysical and Hydrochemical Studies to Map Saltwater Infiltration into Freshwater aquifers: A case study of Ikoyi, Lagos State, Nigeria**”

**Submitted: 20 December 2021**

**Accepted: 22 February 2022**

**Published: 31 March 2022**

Corresponding Author: **Osariere Airen**

Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n11p240

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Amina WAFIK, Morroco

**Reviewer 2:** Mario Adelfo Batista Zaldívar

**Reviewer 2:** Blinded

**Reviewer 2:** Adegbite Joseph Taye

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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:	
University/Country: Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 31 december 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 18 January 2022
<b>Manuscript Title: Geophysical and Hydrochemical Studies to Map Saltwater Infiltration into Freshwater aquifers: A case study of Ikoyi, Lagos State</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 78.12.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## **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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Yes the title is adequate</b>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Yes it is</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The article is written in a clear and concise style</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Yes</b> <b>A map of the location of the surveys and samples should be inserted at the beginning of the article.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>An interpretive model of the results should be established to map the contamination of freshwater by saltwater, as indicated in the title.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>yes</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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!***

Date Manuscript Received: 18/01/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/01/2022
Manuscript Title: Geophysical and Hydrochemical Studies to Map Saltwater Infiltration into Freshwater aquifers: A case study of Ikoyi, Lagos State	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1278/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: 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>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title is clear, appropriate and it synthesizes the results of the investigation.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The abstract doesn't fulfill the internal structure for its writing; that is to say, problematic, objective, methodology, results and conclusions.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The charts don't fulfill the edition norms.</i>	

<i>The figures are not readable.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>It is explained with enough clarity and depth the methodology used in the carried out investigation.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The discussion of the results is insufficient, poor.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The conclusions are sustained more in the results, not so much this way in the interpretation of them (discussion). The conclusions should appear for separate, and numbered.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The references are not orderly alphabetically. It makes an appointment to Omatsola and Adegoke (1981); however, it doesn't appear in the references. The investigation is outdated, because of the 35 references only one (2,9%) it corresponds at the last five years and four (11,4%) they have between 5 and 10 years of having published. That is to say, only five (14,3%) of the references they are of the last 10 years. So that 30 references (85,7% of the total) they have more than 10 years, of those which 11 (36,7%) they have more than 20 years.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

I suggest that they demand to the authors that modernize the bibliographical references and that they improve the discussion of the results, contrasting these with those obtained in previous investigations.

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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!***

Date Manuscript Received: 18/01/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/01/2022
Manuscript Title: Geophysical and Hydrochemical Studies to Map Saltwater Infiltration into Freshwater aquifers: A case study of Ikoyi, Lagos State	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1278/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title is clear, appropriate and it synthesizes the results of the investigation.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The abstract doesn't fulfill the internal structure for its writing; that is to say, problematic, objective, methodology, results and conclusions.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The charts don't fulfill the edition norms.</i>	

<i>The figures are not readable.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>It is explained with enough clarity and depth the methodology used in the carried out investigation.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The discussion of the results is insufficient, poor.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The conclusions are sustained more in the results, not so much this way in the interpretation of them (discussion). The conclusions should appear for separate, and numbered.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The references are not orderly alphabetically. It makes an appointment to Omatsola and Adegoke (1981); however, it doesn't appear in the references. The investigation is outdated, because of the 35 references only one (2,9%) it corresponds at the last five years and four (11,4%) they have between 5 and 10 years of having published. That is to say, only five (14,3%) of the references they are of the last 10 years. So that 30 references (85,7% of the total) they have more than 10 years, of those which 11 (36,7%) they have more than 20 years.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

I suggest that they demand to the authors that modernize the bibliographical references and that they improve the discussion of the results, contrasting these with those obtained in previous investigations.