



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6467
Title of the Manuscript:	Integrated Electromagnetic and Magnetic Survey for Hydrogeophysical Characterization of Ijapo Housing Estate, Akure.
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	The Author was able to satisfactorily correlate the results of the VLF-EM and those of the magnetics to delineate possible areas of fractures beneath the study area in order to propose zones of possible aquifer. The superimposition of the "fracture" map from one of the methods to the second undoubtedly gave a better picture of the structural features beneath the study area.	It is quite pleasing to see one work been approved by a professional colleague, I strongly agree with your comments.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The euler deconvolution method used for the interpretation of the magnetic data is fairly appropriate. A plot of the quadrature versus the positive (position) for the VLF could possible be carried out on the azimuthal diagram. This could serve as another alternate interpretation technique to further delineate the conductive zones within the study area.	The quadrature component is the same as the Imaginary component, and so both the "real" and "imaginary" i.e. the "in-phase" and the "quadrature" are both represented on the graph. I must also add that the quadrature component respond to the lateral variation and not the vertical variation within the subsurface which may not be due to steeply-dipping linear features such as fractures as in this case study. In any case, I appreciate all the comments and adjustment will be made where necessary.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The data stations used, which is located at 20m for the VLF and 25m for the magnetic survey is fairly ok. The researcher should have attempted using equal grid spacing and allowing the two sets of data to fall on same locations to test for linearity. This might possibly further enhance the general correlation factor between the two methods used and also aid in better final conclusions of the underground structures targeted.	I quite agree with you, but it may not be possible to address that now, since that will mean repeating the whole project all over. This is noted, and effort will be made to adhere to that suggestion in the future.