



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_16279
Title of the Manuscript:	Hydrogeology and Water Quality Assessment of the Middle Aquiferous Horizon of Onisha in Anambra Basin, Eastern Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original 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>)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The article is scientifically poorly written. There is not enough data to support most of the conclusions derived. For instance: The authors base the conclusions about abstractions causing a depression just on one data set of measurements. The same applies on quality. This is just one example, more detailed comments can be found within the PDF file, these have been placed using sticky notes.	The authors disagree and advise that reviewer take proper care to go through the manuscript/article as there are enough proof to support claims even though significant corrections were made.