



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/1818
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation of Variation in Resistivity with Depth and Soil Compaction in parts of River State, Southern Nigeria.

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The text was corrected according to the first comments. However, the scientific aim of the study is not still clear. The reading of this article does not allow understanding what the objective of this work and the context is really. Objectives connected to the farming and to the construction of roads are sometimes quoted but never clarified. A comparison between VES and borehole is proposed: what is the originality of this work? The relation between density and dielectric constant is interesting but we do not understand the link with the rest of the study nor the way this result can be exploited for the aimed objectives. This document still required a big work of synthesis, clarification and structuring.	We have tried to explain the aim/objectives of the study in both the Abstract section (line 4), and in the Introduction section (line 9 on page 2). The objectives to a very great extent were achieved as pointed out under 'Result and Discussion' section (last paragraph on page 7) and on the last paragraph before 'Conclusion' section on page 8. Section 4 (Conclusion) also pointed out the link in variation between the different soil electrical properties – resistivity, dielectric constant, density of the various soil types. The target for the study is to identify the best soil type for dry season agricultural farming and not on road construction. The only place soil compaction was mentioned in the manuscript is on line 5 on page 2. The statement is however, purely literature review, and not meant to be part of the objectives of the study. As stated on the last paragraph under 'Results and Discussion', the borehole Lithologic log was compared with the geoelectric section in order to show that the Lithologic boundaries inferred from VES analysed data are reliable. Your good observations which have helped tremendously in improving the quality of this work demands for deeper future research in the study area.

I made a review of the revised manuscript. The author took into account a number of my first comments, in particular on the form. However, it always persists a underlying problem: the objective of this study is absolutely not clear and the methods to reach there either. The presented results are not original and there is no explicit link between the *in situ* measurements (VES and borehole) and the measurements of laboratory. In the light of the above, I cannot accept this article and. I propose to the author general comments (in the attached document) but not in more detail.