**Referee's Report**

The structure for the EAJSE referee report should be presented to order information from most important to least important. Because, the aim is not to build to a conclusion, but to start with the conclusion, and then justify it with increasing hardness. That is, justify each individual argument in the main analysis, notice your reasoning in the introduction, give the recommendation, keep the minor suggestions to the end. Therefore, the structure of the EAJSE Referee Report should include the followings.

* Critical review of the paper
* Analysis
* Main Body of the Comments
* Recommendations
* Minor Comments

Now please go through the following items and fill it based on your review on the paper.

1. **Paper’s basic information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of the Paper:  | **Distribution and Petrology of Metamorphic Rock in Iraq** |
| Manuscript ID: | 2023-V9-I2-P9 |
| Submission Date: | 19.02.2023 |
| Review Due Date: | 25.03.2023 |
| Section Editor:  | Orhan Tug |
| Journal:  | Eurasian Journal of Science & Engineering (Eurasian J. Sci. Eng.) |
| Publisher: | Tishk International University |

1. **Reviewer’s Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Academic Title: | Assistant Prof. |
| Full Name: | Ahmed M. Aqrawi |
| Affiliation: | Salalahaddin University, College of Sciences  |
| Country: | Iraq |
| Specialization: | Petrology and Mineralogy  |
| E-Mail: | Ahmed.aqrawi@su.edu.krd  |

1. **Overall evaluation of the paper. Put** $✔$ **mark as applicable in the boxes below.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Yes** | **No** |
| Do you have a conflict of interest when reviewing this paper? Do you collaborate with these authors, are they your personal friends, or are they direct competitors? Have you reviewed (or rejected) this paper before?  |  | Continue to fill the form |
| **Manuscript questions** | **Poor** | **Average**  | **Good** | **Excellent** |
| Do the title and abstract cover the main aspects of the paper, would it attract the interest of the right audience? | **X** |  |  |  |
| Is the Introduction well written to follow for most readers of this particular journal? Does it cite the appropriate papers? Does it provide a hypothesis or aim of the study? | **X** |  |  |  |
| Does the Methods section provide enough details for the general reader to repeat the experiments? | **X** |  |  |  |
| If you skip the Methods, does the Results section give the right amount of detail to understand the basic details of the experiments? | **X** |  |  |  |
| Do the Results refer to the figures in a logical order? Do the numbers in the tables add up correctly? Are any figures/tables mislabeled or unclear? | **X** |  |  |  |
| Given the data that was obtained in this study, did the authors perform all the logical analyses? Did they include the proper controls? | **X** |  |  |  |
| Does the Discussion address the main findings, and does it give proper recognition to similar work in this field? | **X** |  |  |  |
| In general, is the paper easy to follow and does it have a logical flow? Are there any language issues? | **X** |  |  |  |
| Did the authors make all their data (if there is) (e.g. sequence reads, code, questionnaires used) available for the readers? | **X** |  |  |  |
| Is this paper novel and an advancement of the field, or have other people done very similar work? | **X** |  |  |  |
| Does the paper raise any ethical concerns? Any suspicion of plagiarism (text or experiments), duplicated or tampered images, lack of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, unethical animal experiments, or “dual use of research concern”? | **X** |  |  |  |

1. **Referee’s Recommendations**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Put** $✔X$ **mark** |
| This paper is well written, well organized, and well supported by the scientific findings. Therefore, I recommend it be accepted in its present form. |  |
| This paper is well written, well organized, and well supported by the scientific findings. But, it should be accepted subject to the following condition(s). The following revisions required. |  |
| This paper should be resubmitted for review because major revisions required. See the following recommendations. |  |
| This paper should be rejected for the following reason(s) | **X** |

1. **Referee’s Comments for Author(s) (continue on another sheet, if necessary)**

Please write your comments by mentioning the page and line number of points item by item such as;

1. The abstract does not cover the main aspects of the paper
2. Page 1 line 5 (the Northern Zagros Needle Zone (NZSZ)) it is the Northern Zagros Suture Zone
3. There is no aim of study
4. Page 1 line 28 (alluded to that as the Iraqi Zagros Surge Area (IZTZ) ??? I think it is Iraqi Zagros Thrust Zone ( IZTZ)
5. The introduction is very badly written, its geology and tectonic of Iraqi Zagros Thrust Zone.
6. There are no methodology number of samples? no coordination of studied samples.
7. The author used the word stone in mamani places such as, page 3 line 70, line 78, and page 4 lines 130, 134 , the correct is rocks not stone .
8. Fig. 4-1 and 4-2 page 5 there are no references
9. There are no results and discussion of the results
10. The plates are copy of plate of the Ph. D thesis Karo, N., J., 2015 Metamorphic evolution of the Northern Zagros Suture Zone (NZSZ), not mentioned the reference
11. Fig 5.1 page 9 no caption
12. **Referee’s Comments for Editor(s) (if any)**

Please write your comments to the editorial board about the paper if you have any.

The research is extracted from a Ph.D. thesis, 2015, Potsdam University \_ Germany). I am one of the supervisors