



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 (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	<i>The paper deals with and interesting problem related to the influence of the anisotropy and heterogeneity in a electrical conducting media. This topic is crucial to better analyse the results coming from the experimental geophysical surveys and to well identify geological structures. Then, papers about this topic are welcomed and must be encouraged.</i> <i>However, I have to point out many drawbacks and critical comments to the work.</i> <i>The overall quality of the paper is low. It is not acceptable that in a scientific paper a lot of sentence are ambiguous and cannot be easily understood. All the text is a sequence of vague and in many cases scholastic sentences.</i> <i>It is not clear how the results displayed in table 1 have been obtained. It is not possible to evaluate the mathematical process followed for obtaining the apparent resistivity data.</i>	That is a commendation. The reviewer has all the freedom of being over verbose and critical; however, this is of value to any literary presentation if constructive. Well, efforts have been made to address as much as possible most of the observations. In addition scholarship does not end in one article; it is suppose to encourage foraging from others.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>The references are few and not completely sufficient to cover the topic under study.</i> <i>As general comment, I cannot fully evaluate the quality of the paper. My opinion is that the paper strongly requires a complete revision and a more detailed and clear description of the work.</i> <i>In the present form, the paper cannot be considered for publication.</i> <i>I suggest to the authors to re-submit again the paper after an accurate and deeply revision.</i>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		