



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Geographical Research</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_AJGR_53627</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>EFFECTS OF FLOOD RISK LEVELS ON FOOD SECURITY, LIVELIHOOD AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS IN THE FLOOD-PRONE AREAS OF THE CORE NIGER DELTA, NIGERIA</b> |
| 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>)



**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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>The manuscript has an interesting approach and brings important elements. The theoretical and / or empirical definitions were well elaborated and considered important elements. Data set and data analysis methods are suitable for research. The manuscript has the potential to be accepted by the journal, but it needs some adjustments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plagiarism of the study is quite high, especially in the introduction. It must be rewritten.</li> <li>2. Applying the scales to factor analysis and giving the total variance explained may improve the quality of the study. Then, the relationship between the participants' socioeconomic characteristics and the factors obtained can be examined by regression analysis.</li> <li>3. The results, for the most part, were only presented and little explored, especially those related to the technical aspects. It is important that the results are discussed from the technical point of view.</li> <li>4. Check the bibliographic references in the text with those listed in the list.</li> <li>5. There are few grammatical errors in the study. Check it.</li> </ol> |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      |   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    |   |   |

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                    |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Seyit Hayran</b>                |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Cukurova University, Turkey</b> |