



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_36742
Title of the Manuscript:	Hydrocarbon spill site characterization by Electrical Resistivity Tomography and Ground Penetrating Radar methods - A review
Type of the Article	Minireview Paper

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	- Review seems to be shallow. The author(s) did not empirically analyze the relationship between the measured parameters (resistivities and dielectric permittivities) and the magnitude, maturity (age ?) and spread of the oil contaminants. - Review processed GPR radargrams acquired over recent and aged hydrocarbon conterminants. The only radargram shown in this respect (Fig. 9) is not processed. Information on this radargram is obscured by noise (low SNR). - Replace "(fig.--)" with "(Fig.--)" throughout the text.	- Some revision effected on empirical analysis, however, the scope of the work is to showcase the workability of non-invasive geophysical methods (ERT and GPR) for hydrocarbon spill site characterisation. Reference to age of spill was made severally in the text for both geophysical methods, whereas, magnitude of spills is not captured in the scope of this study. - Some revision effected on radargrams. Non processed radargram has been replaced appropriately "fig." has been replaced with "Fig." throughout the text as recommended
Minor REVISION comments	Line 63 : separate methodology with result. In most review papers, the structure is: introduction, Body (can take any relevant headings and subheadings) and conclusion. Line 88 – 89 needs citation Line 132: replace "measured" with "detected" Line 139: "A-scan" not "a scan" Line 184: Fig. 9 is a raw radargram. Need processing, processing technique need to be explained. As it is, information from it may not be accurate. Refer to processing of GPR data. Line 236: date in smaller font. Line 258: Give URL address. Lin2 293: incomplete referencing. Give URL address if possible..	Line 63: Revised Line 88 – 89: Revised Line 132: Revised Line 139: Revised (Better Put "A Radarscan") Line 184: Radargram Replaced Appropriately Line 236: Revised Line 258: Url unavailable Line 293: Url provided
Optional/General comments	Line 65: "resistivity machine" not a technical term; "terrameter" is more technical. Line 95: citation format unconventional	Line 65: Revised Line 95: Consistent