



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_17834
Title of the Manuscript:	MEASUREMENT OF THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY AND SPECIFIC HEAT CAPACITY OF THREE MAJOR GEOMORPHOLOGICAL UNITS IN AKWA IBOM STATE, NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Basic research

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- abstract is too much brief, needs more explanation, there is no objective in the abstract. 2- The scientific notation should be coherent in terms of units. If authors use subindex or not. 3- Authors talk about the effect of the specific heat capacity on the crops and civil engineering works. Afterwards, these statements are not referenced on the manuscript anymore. 4- Where are the objectives of this study? 5- Why mention geomorphological units on the title and never more on the rest of the manuscript? 6- Needs more samples to be sure that the results are correct. The study of the geomorphological units are very complex, and needs a powerful dataset to evaluate the behavior of each unit in terms of thermal properties. 7- Heat budget equation does not exist, in this case use the term balance. 8- Why should the equations be rewritten?? 9- What happens in depth with the thermal properties. Sometime, sampling few centimeters of the surface is not enough to characterize the whole of the soil, actually less when we are talking about the	1. Comment not relevant. 2. That has been corrected in line 10 and in the main work. 3. SHC has effect on both crops and civil works. It was ignored with the mine that it is well known; but few things have been added to the manuscript on SHC. 4. The objective is to: measure and compare the thermal conductivity and SHC of soil samples from different locations. 5. It is called geomorphological units OR Landforms. 6. Many authors have carried out study on the geomorphological units in different parts of Nigeria, so you can carry out a comparison OR comparative study to test the results. - Reviewer comment NOT relevant. 7. The term balance has been used to experiences the equation. 8. It has been corrected. 9. Reviewer comment NOT relevant because any point in the formation that the sample is taken will give



SDI Review Form 1.6

	geomorphological units. 10- I can't understand what is meaning "samples were dried in the soil" 11- Soil samples need a strong physical and chemical analysis to confirm and help to undertand better why their thermal behavior were in this way. 12- Authors not consider the mooisture of the samples. This is an important factor when heat transfer wants to be assessed and understood. 13- Strongly remarks that the results section never to start with tables or figures. Remake all the section 14- Not use equations and calculations in results sections. These operations correspond to methodology section. 15- Same for anova 16- Figures are not rellevant, not show anymore. 17- Conclusions are not clear, and are not relevants with the manuscript	overall nature of that formation. 10. afterwards dried in the ground or floor... corrected. 11. This was done. 12. The moisture was consider, and dried. 13. Reviewer comment NOT relevance. 14. Reviewer comment NOT relevance. 15. Reviewer comment NOT relevance 16. Reviewer comment NOT relevance, figure are much relevance 17. Reviewer comment NOT relevance
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1- title should be reviewed. 2- Authors should more references on the Introduction section as well as the subsequently sections of the manuscript. 3- The manuscripts needs a discusion section, or to be more specific in the results and conclusions section, with references 4- table 2 is not clear. 5- in general tables and figures need to explain better 6- keywords not should be in the title Any plagiarism was found out in this article relate to the literature.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	At this point, the article needs to be reviewed deeply. It is covenient that authors spent a lot of time to review and remake all the manuscript. Authors should have int o account that the scientific journals have a reputation and prestige. When the authors decide to sent a manuscript to publish must think on these statements as well. In my opinion, the manuscripts is almost irreparable, even though whether the authors spent time and more science knowledge in it, the manuscript could to be evaluated and reviewed again for publishing.	