

Final evaluation by associate editor

I think the authors must act to second referee and avoid too descriptive, with lack of data support analysis.

The authors did not correct completely cases 3, 4 and 6. Instead of giving formula or array figure in the third, they have deleted the text.

Descriptive data should reveal subsurface features in the table1. Therefore, Table 1 is very amateur and it is often unclear to the reader. Software mentioned, quickly and accurately convert raw data into interesting sub-sections.

The geological units mentioned in the text, but the reader may not sum to connect them with other paper content. Adding sections or geological maps will solve the problem to some extent.

I think the second referee comments must be observed to some extent. This paper is too descriptive, with lack of profiles or cross-sections in order to understand the sub-surface characterization of the geo-electric layers and their geology. Furthermore, the authors must correct some of these cases:

1- Line 45-57: A topographic map or Google Earth image is displayed, rather than describe.

2- A scale bar is brought in Figure 1, 2 and 3.

3- Line 109-130: Schlumberger array is shown as figure or formula instead too descriptive.

4- Resistivity variations in the table 1 must be shown a cross-section. A few software help to this object (such as Res2DInv)

5- Line 175: Fractures due to what? Folding or faults? No reason not mentioned. It was better to provide a geological map of the area.

6- Geologic units mentioned in the line 192,193, 264-275 of manuscript, but maps and cross sections do not accompany descriptions.

7- Line243: Types of soils provided, however no profiles and cross sections.

8- There are mistakes in writing in particular terminology, some of come into the word file of the attachment.

After corrections, it was to make the final decision about publication.

Editor's Details:

Fazel Khaleghi

Geology department

Azad University

Tabriz

IRAN