

# Review of: "Groundwater Potential Zone Assessment Using Remote Sensing, Geographical Information System (GIS), and Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) Techniques in Fogera Woreda, South Gondar Zone, Ethiopia"

Ch Jyotiprava Dash

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. The present introduction section is too short, and its content is not able to convince the readers about the importance and contribution of the study. The clarification regarding the rationale behind the intention to conduct the study is lacking. Further, the research gap between previous or past similar studies and the present study is nowhere mentioned in the manuscript. The objective of the present study is also not mentioned. Apart from that, the authors should cite recent references.
2. Similarly, the materials and methods section is too short and not convincing at all. The authors mentioned they used a digital elevation model (DEM) downloaded from the Alaska Satellite Facility to prepare soil, slope, lineament density, drainage density, rainfall, distance from the river, elevation, and TWI. How they generated a soil map from the DEM, please clarify.
3. Further, they used a Sentinel-2 image for preparing the LULC map. The details of the procedure followed and information on the accuracy of the developed map are lacking in the manuscript.
4. Please mention in detail the overlay analysis.
5. The authors have mentioned the intensity of rainfall is very high in the study area during the summer season. Please give quantitative information about rainfall intensity. Higher rainfall does not always indicate high recharge. Recharge depends on soil properties along with rainfall. Please provide the infiltration rate of your study area soil.
6. Please describe more about the properties of the lithological units present in your study area for better clarification of how they influence recharge. Also, include a drainage map of the study area.
7. The authors only highlighted their results. The discussion part is completely missing.
8. Apart from this, the manuscript is very poorly written.
9. At the present format, I recommend that the manuscript be rejected for publication. Authors can resubmit it as a new submission after improving the manuscript.

Thank you.