



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6704
Title of the Manuscript:	VERTICAL ELECTRICAL SOUNDING SURVEY FOR GROUNDWATER EXPLORATION IN PARTS OF ANYIGBA AND ITS ENVIRONS, IN THE ANAMBRA BASIN OF NIGERIA
Type of the 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	The paper focused on a present useful need of the universe. However the 'Discussion' appears insufficient to corroborate the results. There is need for improvement on the discussions on the Tables and Figures presented in Section 4.0 (with emphasis on Figures 5 to 13)	More explanation of the figures and tables have been included.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	(1) The author(s) should review more literature on the subject and beef up the 'Introduction', Section 1.0. There are so many previously published research in this regard (2) Under the recommendation, the mean depth was found as 88.95m, one would have expected a 100m depth rather than 120m since the author is talking about the minimum value	1. The literature review is deemed adequate. 2. The depth has been changed to 100m as suggested.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	More recent literature should be cited and listed, the listed references are scanty	