



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	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	General comments: The manuscript attempts the mapping of the contaminant plume of leachate from rubbish at the dumpsite of Hevie, Benin with the help of geophysical tools. Despite the topic, that is undoubtedly relevant (but not completely new), the overall quality of the manuscript is poor. The in situ data set itself appears to be valid and in some cases valuable. However, the discussion is wandering, incomplete, and deeply flawed scientifically, and it is nearly unreadable. In fact, the scientific methods seem fairly valid and not clearly outlined. Overall, <i>I cannot recommend it for publication.</i> Specific comments: I have two primary concerns with the manuscript and accompanying data. 1) The grammar, spelling and overall descriptions are confusing and insufficient to fully understand what has been done. Even making allowances for the fact that the authors' first language is not English, the manuscript is in poor shape. Almost half the sentences have grammatical errors, commonly involving misuse of articles; agreements among subjects, objects, and verbs. e.g "that is to say" (line 84), "to the seasons" (line 76) etc.. The style of writing includes quite some long and complex sentences that are sometimes difficult to read and distracting from the actual content. I suggest dividing such	Ok



SDI Review Form 1.6

	sentences into shorter sentences. In addition, several confusing or incomplete sentences can be found in the text e.g. <i>"In African towns, a few kilograms of municipal and domestic waste is produced per day, per family"</i> (lines 23-24). In addition, several signs of harshly finished manuscript can be found, Signs of being submitted in a hurry!!!! e.g. <i>References, V.Naudet & al 2004 is Revil et al., 2004</i> (lines 27, 29 etc), Yalo et al., 2012 can not be found in the references section (line 47), Monteiro-Santos et al., 2006 (line 42), Marescot (2003) not 2008, etc line 187, first survey (S1) not S3 line 189, third survey (S3) not S1 <i>The paper should be reviewed (before re-submission) by a native speaker of English. The authors should make sure that the paper conforms to the grammar, style, and spelling standards of scientific papers.</i> 2) My main concerns are largely due to the paper lacking clearness and thoroughness. The manuscript (mainly the discussion section) includes a potpourri of irrelevant and redundant information which drowns the actually important aspects. Discussion of important issues is missing. In fact the presentation of the data is confusing, unstructured and	Ok It's also .Naudet & al 2004 Ok Ok Ok
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	partially repetitive. For instance, I was several times informed that “Four (04) surveys, were carried out site on the whole of the site”. I generally urge the authors to revise the text with a clear focus in mind. <u>Introduction.</u> In contrast to an abstract, author(s) provides a tedious and prolonged talk to reach their objectives of this study in introduction section. In introduction section, you should not only show your expert knowledge on this specific area, but provide a concise and well-turned expression. Please better clarify the objective(s) of this and the main outcomes of other researches. The study objectives may require to be streamlined to what is achievable and permissible in context of the available data. This effort will help improve the articulation of every aspect of the document. <u>Discussion.</u> Even though authors did not provide all detailed (or full) discussion on the obtained literature review results to the readers, they should often extend their reasonable idea as far as they could go. Of course, this may depend on style of international journals, but current manuscript appears to have too narrow summary regarding a discussion of the results. <u>Conclusions.</u> In many papers, author(s) often provides a list of summaries in conclusion section. So, I recommend author(s) to summarize their findings per Section. I would	Ok Ok Ok
--	---	-------------------------------



SDI Review Form 1.6

	also like to see a small discussion in the conclusion section how the findings in this paper can potential be built on in further research on this topic.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		