



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	-The author should be able to specify areas mentioned in the abstract; e.g. areas that are susceptible to structural failure under high stress conditions, if possible, use coordinates. This is important since abstract is supposed to summarise the entire work -rearrange abstract to follow: what has been done, results, brief methodology used to obtain results, aim, suggestions/benefits of the research Is the author able to compare results obtained in this research to previous ones if there are? Are there improvements or challenges? Discuss	We respectfully submit that the abstract here is not for thesis. Journal abstracts have limited word count. Necessary presentations have been done in the body of the work. There is no hard and fast rule guiding the writing of abstracts. The points mentioned here were taken care of. This research is fundamentally based on a new approach. The approach is aimed at preventing future occurrence of problem, not solving existing problem. There is no related work in the study area to compare.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-Elastic parameters is not properly reflected in the abstract but the author added it to keywords -line 53, start a new paragraph from Akpabuyo -lines 54-55, what are the evidences to back up your claim? If possible, use map to explain -line 57, goal should be at the end of introduction. -line 62, Are you able to support your statement here with examples of civil engineering structures?	Restpectfull, abstract must not carry all the details and keywords are not for only the abstract. Line 53: It gives meaning to the previous sentence. Lines 54-55: These are things of common knowledge. Line 57: This does not amount to listing the goals of the research.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 69, no citation -lines 70-72, put citation -lines 73-75, put citation -line 76-79, put citation -Lines 84-86, put citation -line 93, is the author able to show this on a google map or any other plot to support this section -line 104, which researchers...? (put citation) -start seismic refraction line 107 on a new paragraph Lines 127-128, citation The author must insert references where necessary, I have pointed out some sections where citations are paramount	Line 62: Refenced examples have been made where a building collapse or a highway got bad due to the nature of the foundation materials. Lines 70 through 86: Necessary citations have been inserted. Line 93: See Fig. 1. Line 104: See lines 105-107 Line 127-128: The two sentences have been linked.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a good research work	