



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	The ideas suggested by the Title and Abstract are reasonably interesting but the Authors have not done enough explanations to draw conclusions from the work. More so, the Authors should provide more information on what was done in order to present the article as readable, comprehensible and also improve upon the scientific contents.	This has been adequately attended to.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	This article is too short to give an overview of series of studies done concerning this technique. There are lots of presumptions in the article!	The article has been grossly enriched
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I suggest that more information be provided to improve upon the readership and scientific contents of the article.	That has been done