



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14783
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of Database Technology in the Software of Seismic Data Acquisition
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	There are not enough details on the proposed approach and used technologies. The paper definitely lacks the boldness and completion one usually expects from a journal paper. In the header, it says "seismic data acquisition", but there is nothing related to it in the paper. The title needs to be changed or the paper needs to be rewritten. Browser/server (B/S) and Client/server (C/S) are defined by authors. But they are the same. Why are these terms used in different meaning? They are the same in client-server systems. This is also called request-response or request-reply paradigm. Related work and literature review on the subject matter is missing. It is not clear what the state of the art of the paper is. Figures need to be elaborated and they need more details. There are missing arrows. Authors are claiming that they are proposing a surface experiment data processing system but there is no information about the system. Are seismic surface experiment data different from the other kinds of data? Do they need different system	The software constructed for the data acquisition and this is the main purpose of the paper, see Fig. 2 and subtitle no 5.1 B/S & C/S are well explained in subtitle no 4.1 Combination of C/S & B/S. Arrows has been completed in Fig.2 The software has been developed for the data a question. And not device.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	for querying and processing? These issues need to be clarified, and the ideas need to be presented more fluently. There are actually too many missing references to be listed. References are very old. Authors should give more recent and more related reference list. Is the surface seismic data different from the other data? If so, in what respect they are different? Are they spatial point data? Do they need different spatial querying and processing? Is your system supporting topological analysis and decision making? Are you creating location-based services? There are many related issues and concerns in this domain and you should mention about them. You should also position your study with respect to best practices by giving closely related recent references.	Some reference has been added The software are developed for the processing and interpretation of the Surface data only and not for the subsurface data
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		