



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The objective of the study only appears in the abstract. How the measured resistivity values validated in the study? No information on boreholes profile to relate with the resistivity measurements? The information on pumping test of well at various locations was not mention to support the interpretation on groundwater yield of various geologic formation. Conclusions are too brief and do not essentially represent the concrete results of the study.	With the modifications being made from suggestions of the reviewers, the present revised manuscript stand for the objective of the abstract. As the sample number is high and with geological assessments had been taken as supportive approach, no other specific assessments were taken for the present study. As of the present study is brief in its approach, the conclusions were thus made to suit the outcome in an appropriate way.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	First half of the results and the discussion section are essentially not refer to the result of study! It's just talking about literature review on resistivity measurement.	The whole manuscript has been rearranged by summarizing many sections. Especially the introduction section citing literature review has been cut short to focus on intent of the study. Many parts of the assessments were also summarized by deleting lengthy discussions.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper is lack on detailed technical analysis. Too descriptive, with lack of data support analysis.	