



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_5891
Title of the Manuscript:	GEOPHYSICAL MONITORING OF ALONG THANDAVA RIVER BASIN FOR THE PROSPECTS OF GROUNDWATER IN THE HARD ROCK TERRAIN REGIONS OF EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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) The title should be looked into, not grammatically correct and a bit too long. 2) Some of the contents are too long. Manuscript for publication should summarise as much as possible the main project work. 3) Geo-electric sections should be produced in areas where "VES" stations align in order to understand the sub-surface characterization of the geo-electric layers and their corresponding geology. e.g ves 40-45, 46-50, 30-38 e.t.c. 4) In the discussion, emphasis should be made on the basis for the classification of the aquifer as having good, excellent potentials .i.e resistivity ranges, overburden thickness, anisotropy or any other parameter used in classifying the aquifer .It seems the author relies mostly on curve type. Curve type is good but additional parameters are needed.	1) The title has been checked and modified. 2) As suggested (marked as red) most of the parts in introduction and assessments have been removed and the manuscript has been summarized. 3) As of the sample number is high, only individual interpretation had been made. The overall assessment had been from the segregation of these results. Also as there is a geological assessment made separately it seems more confirmative from these results and supports the views of the study. 4) As obvious of the nature of sample number coupled with geological assessment, stress was laid to interpret from the curve type rather than correlating with other parameters. The authors agree that usage of any other parameter would be good for supportive statements along with curve interpretations.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Figure caption should be below the figure and not above as it is in the manuscript. Only tables should be at the top.	1) Figure captions were corrected and kept below the figure.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2) Note in the Conclusion, The author gave resistivity unit to be in meters instead of ohm-m.	2) Resistivity unit has been changed to ohm-m.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A well –conceived research. The results reported are very interesting but efforts should be made on incorporating other parameters to effectively classify the groundwater potential zones in the area.	