



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_PSIJ_13821
Title of the Manuscript:	GEOPHYSICAL DETERMINATION OF THE CAUSES OF EROSION IN SOME PARTS OF ABIA STATE, SOUTHEASTERN 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. The full stop at the of the title should be removed</p> <p>2. Line 10- "goes ahead in determining the" should become "determines"</p> <p>3. Line 16 "are" should be changed to "were"</p> <p>4. In the introduction, line 28, "rock" should read "rocks"</p> <p>There are too many paragraphs in the introduction section whereby in some cases one sentence constitutes a paragraph. It is advised the author (s) merge some of the paragraphs and limit the whole introduction to 5-6 paragraphs instead of 26. Also one or two references should be included to cover lines 35-44.</p> <p>5. In the materials and methods section, the author(s) should report exactly what he/she (they) did and how he/she (they) did it. Lines 35-44 looks like literature review of the materials and methods rather than what is expected of this section. Lines 165-195 should be adopted for this section but also, the number of paragraphs should be reduced. Table 1 presented under this section is supposed to be in the results section and the title should read "A profile.....and location points in the study area"</p> <p>6. One is worry when two figs. 1 are presented (pages 4 (map) and 8.</p> <p>7. Results and Discussion. Table 2: Resistivity type curves of VES locations in..... (You should name the study area. Fig.3a: Geoelectric sections of what? See Fig. 3b also. Line 268- Amos-Uheghu et.al (2012) should read-Amos-Uheghu <i>et al.</i>, 2012</p>	<p>Thank you, it has been corrected Corrected now line 11</p> <p>Corrected now line 17</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected The paragraphs before lines 162 under materials and methods were a justification for the choice of geoelectrical methods in the study. Paragraphs have been reduced and Table 1 taken to Results and Discussions as suggested.</p> <p>Thank you, it has been corrected</p> <p>The locations have been named as suggested The points of the geoelectric sections included Corrected</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Also, (Ward, 1990), Telford et.al (1990), and Lowrie, 2007, should read "Also, Ward, 1990, Telford <i>et al.</i>, 1990 and Lowrie, 2007.</p> <p>Line 278- coincided should read coincides, gotten should read got</p> <p>Line 279-including should be replaced with "such as"</p> <p>There's should read" There is"</p> <p>Line 302-Remove "Recall that" such that the sentence should start with" The data.....</p> <p>Line 304- Replace "Recall" with "Also"</p> <p>Line 306- Remove "Now" and let the sentence starts with " From table 1"</p> <p>Line 307- the colon after "is" should be removed</p> <p>Lines 316 and 317 should read" Thus from the geoelectric section, 16.6m was calculated as the actual thickness of the sediments while measurements using lithological/surface elevation gave a value of 10.7m. The correction factor is therefore calculated as $16/10.7 = 1.55$</p> <p>Line 322-" we divide by the correction factor" should read " the actual thickness of the sediments in this station (i.e. 18.8m) was divided by the correction factor. So the actual thickness is $18.8m/1.55 = 12.1m$</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The second sentence in this section does not really make any sense. So author (s) should check this and make necessary correction.</p> <p>Generally, the author (s) should check the guidelines for authors of PSIJ to see how the numbering of sections and subsections are done. The authors should also the check the referencing style recommended by PSIJ. Author(s) should equally check the references because some references cited in the text are not found in the list of the references and some that are in the reference list are not cited in the text.</p>	<p>Corrected but now line 350</p> <p>Corrected but now line 351</p> <p>Corrected but now line 374</p> <p>Corrected but now line 376</p> <p>Corrected but now line 378</p> <p>Corrected but now line 379</p> <p>Corrected but now line 387 to 389</p> <p>The conclusion has been rephrased</p>
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Author(s) should check grammar in the whole manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Despite some minor issues the manuscript is a good research paper in terms of methods and results. If all the corrections suggested are effected, this will improve the quality of the paper very much.	