



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_BJAST_3133
Title of the Manuscript:	Geoelectric Survey for Mapping Grounwater Flow Pattern in Okigwe District, Niger Delta Sedimentary Area of Southeastern Nigeria.

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 9 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	1. Content: The authors proposed to deduce the groundwater flow pattern from a huge data bank of Electrical resistivity sounding data. However, they seem not to have justified the large volume of data at their disposal through adequate interpretation. The concept is quite good but a more in-depth interpretation should be given to the data. The topic will not reflect the content if based on the present interpretation alone. 2. Introduction: There is no flow in the sentence construction. I suggest that the authors should recast the introduction and refer to previous works done in the area or other areas, using similar techniques. I did not see their "claim" at the end of the introduction. They should make a statement as to why they should embark on this research. What new information can their present research add to what was already known	The data interpretation in section 3 and 3.1 has been improved upon in order to justify the concept of the study. The introduction has been recasted to incorporate the Reviewer's suggestions.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	concerning groundwater flow in the study area. 3. Methodology: Ok 4. Results: Data processing and field curves are good. 5. Interpretation and Discussion of Results: Authors should study and understand the processed results and come up with a more in-depth interpretation. 6. Bibliography/References: Some of the works in the references were not in the main work. These references should be properly cited or removed from the list. 7. Decision: Accept after a Serious Major Revision on the paper.	This section has been amended in order to improve the quality of data interpretation and discussion of results. More interpreted geoelectric curves have also been added. This has been corrected.
<u>theMinor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		