



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14930
Title of the Manuscript:	Seismic Early Warning Foundation Conditions Evaluation Survey for Civil Engineering Constructions in Akpabuyo Local Government Area of Cross River State, 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	Lines 43- 47 ending at the bracket is out of context, so also the words subgrade and subbase . These last two terms are exclusively reserved for pavements. They are not technically or rarely used in any other civil engineering construction. It is suggested they are removed. The use of the two terms in the present context of usage constitutes a misnomer. Line 90-91 is standard highway/pavement construction practices and thereby wrongly attributed to ilori et al. the reference should be removed. What is FERMA? And its relevance to assessment of foundation condition of potential civil engineering sites? Lines 102 -115 talks mostly about pavement failure? Is the sites being evaluated only for highway construction? While one or two cases of highway failures can be cited(not up to the level of detail as presented here -some are awkward or irrelevant to the article theme), other civil engineering failures can be cited. Ref in line 128/129 is not correct so also 132 /133 Line 229-234 should be removed. It contradicts results and inferences or conclusions from the study	Lines 43-47: The two terms has been removed. Lines 90-91: reference removed. On FERMA: We respectfully disagree with the reviewer. FERMA was defined, its activity explained and its inclusion is considered relevant. Lines 102-115: Necessary adjustments have been made. Lines 128/129 and 132/133: A little adjustment was made, but the references are deemed correct. Lines 229-234: The presentation has been recast and additional presentations made, to bring out the intended message. Lines 423-428: The wrongly placed statement has been removed with thanks. Lines 495-497: It has been corrected. Line 503: It has been corrected. Line 505: It has been corrected. Lines 513-516: The reference is no longer necessary and has been removed. Lines 517-519: It was cited, see line 83. Lines 520-521: Reference cited in line 111. Lines 522-524: Reference cited in line 113.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Lines 423 – 428 is repeated in 459 – 463. While the statement is relevant, the appropriate position to place it should be determined by the author. Under References. Lines 495 – 497 Journal name or book is omitted. Line 503, the correct words are surface <i>resistivity</i> Line 505 ref is not in text Lines 513 -516 correct reference is “Ilori, A.O., Obianwu, V. I, and Okwueze , E.E., 2014. Seismic investigation of highway pavement failures in parts of Southeastern Nigeria. <i>Journal of Environmental and Engineering Geophysics. June , Vol. 19, p. 113-134, doi:10.2113/JEEG19.2.113 .</i> Lines 517-519 is listed in the references but not cited within the text Same is line 520 – 521, 522 – 524, ,	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		