



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_12957
Title of the Manuscript:	Orthogonal Azimuthal Cross-square Arrays Electrical Resistivity Technique's Kookiness on Detection for Angular Disposition of Electrical Anisotropy
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

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	1. Line 53, I think the reference Keller and Frischknecht is not 1989 but it is 1966, please re-check it. 2. line 57, Telford ,et al is not in 2009, I think it is in the nineteenth (please re-check it again) 3. line 58 need editing 4. line 60 factor of anisotropy 5. line 67 (please replace the word disposition by configurations or arrays in the whole article) 6. The author did not use much more references, so the article is very poor according to the references which discuss the phenomena of anisotropy and paradox of anisotropy theoretically. 7. There are no figures illustrating the ellipses and the variations of resistivity azimuthally. Table. 1 is not enough for illustration. 8. Discussion and Conclusion are weak.	1. The correct date is 1970 and has been reflected. 2. Somehow but the one used is 2001 and corrected to that date. 3. Addressed as much as possible. 4. Disposition sound much more appropriate as here individual position of each electrode is considered not for the four electrodes as an entity. 5. Article has been enriched accordingly. 6. Has been addressed as recommended. 7. Has been incorporated as requested. 8. Has been improved where necessary.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		