



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_31667
Title of the Manuscript:	PREDICTION OF COMPRESSIONAL WAVE VELOCITY AND FORMATION BULK DENSITY FROM ELECTRICAL RESISTIVITY IN THE SUB-SURFACE OF SOUTH-EAST AND SOUTH-SOUTH 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	1) Please improve the abstract 2) Fig. 2 can be improve 3) Fig. 1 is not clear 4) Table 1 – 'A' should be written as 'a' 5) 'P' should be written as 'p' 6) Is equation 2 is right? I try to calculate and cannot get the answer for Vp 7) Please put the unit in the table, like m, m/s , ohm-m and so on. 8) How the author get the value of $p = 2.65g/3\text{ cm}$ (sandstone) and fluid density $f\rho = 1.1g/3\text{ cm}$. It should be explain	1) Abstract has been reworked and improved upon 2) I have made some adjustments to fig. 2. Basically, I tried to represent all the information obtained from the analysis that I reasoned helped my regression reliability judgement 3) I have improved the clarity of fig. 1 4) Noted and implemented on table 1 in the manuscript 5) Noted and corrected as suggested by the reviewer 6) Thank you for pointing this out. Equation 2 could be reduced for a shallow subsurface structure, so that the one-sixth power could be considered negligible. I have re-worked all the tables using the assumption and assumed values of the constants 'a' and 'b' in equations 2 and 3, for this region where the study was carried out. Therefore, I have corrected the initial values of R, i omitted in computing values for Vp. 7) I have inserted the appropriate units 8) The values of density for sandstone, limestone, dolomite, and that of fluid density etc are common and standard values of matrix density and fluid density; and are reported in many



SDI Review Form 1.6

		literatures like (Gluyas and Swarbrick, 2004; Myers, 2007; Tamunosiki et al., 2014; Horsefall et al., 2015; etc.)
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Spelling mistake	I have corrected some spelling mistakes I noticed in the text
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Very good paper. Congratulation!	Thank you very much