



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_5391
Title of the Manuscript:	Geophysical contribution for the mapping the contaminant plume of leachate from rubbish dumpsite of Hevie, Benin
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment Very weak articulation and improper use of terminologies. Interpretation and statements are not appropriate to the relevant section of geophysics.		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)	
Compulsory REVISION comments	Following terminologies and articulation are not relevant to geophysical methods.		It is non-invasive Aquifer Ok Revelance according to Binley 2003 and Imhoff 2007 Ok Ok Ok in certain conditions Extension Carried out	
	line 38	non-invasive geophysical methods (?)		
	line 79	Aquiferous (?)		
	line 96	revision of total statement is required according to methods.		
	line 143	The statement 'inject of current' doesn't stand for methods.		
	line 147	the sentence is not clear and/or well structured		
	line 149	Inappropriate sentence, not all suitable to methods		
	line 152	Reduced bulk resistivity is expected when organic and inorganic contaminates (?)		
	line 163	What is delimitation?		
	line 185	What does the word 'realized' stands for		
Minor REVISION comments	line 72	title is not explicit enough	Ok	Ok



SDI Review Form 1.6

	line 80	not a explicit statement	Ok
	line 91	source of the section	Ok
	line 127	source of the diagram	
	line 229	Definition (?)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments			