SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BJAST_13540**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Depositional Environment Discrimination using Statistical Parameters of Conglomeratic Outcrop Sections, Obubra Southeastern 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** *(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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Paper focused on application of statistical analysis in order to obtain information about the hydrodynamics and environment of deposition of sedimentary rocks. This paper constitutes an interesting application of the above mentioned statistical methods but do not lead to scientific advances that could be used in the acquisition and processing of data relating to the same field of applications. In fact the importance of statistical analysis applied in the same contest of the presented paper is broadly demonstrate in the international literature. Improvements are request 1) Abstract needs to be more concise, focus on location, need for investigation methods used expected outcomes. 2) Introduction: authors should be clear how your work could be advances the state of the art or the knowledge in this field. I think that the Authors could be focused this	

	paragraph to specify the peculiar aspects of novelty of this paper with respect to other studies performed from other authors. 3) Data are presented in a very confused mode. I believe that would be much more informative if Authors provide additional details about the survey strategy and the analysis procedure. Suggest following breakdown: a) sampling data initial interpretation b) Modelling description and outcomes c) final interpretation of analyzed results 4) Conclusions????	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Università del Salento, Italy**